Peter Hardy F.R.S.

THE ORIGIN OF PRINTING.

IN TWO ESSAYS:

I. The Subſtance of Dr. MIDDLETON's Diſſertation on the Origin of Printing in ENGLAND.
II. Mr. MEERMAN's Account of the Invention of the Art at HARLEIM, and its Progreſs to MENTZ.

WITH OCCASIONAL REMARKS;

AND AN APPENDIX.

THE SECOND EDITION:
With IMPROVEMENTS.

LONDON:
Printed for W. BOWYER and J. NICHOLS,
in Red-Lion-Paſſage, Fleet-Street.
MDCCLXXVI.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE original intention of the Editors of this work was merely to have re-publiſhed Dr. MIDDLETON's Diſſertation on Printing, with occaſional Remarks on ſome Miſtakes of that learned and ingenious Author. This leading into a wider field of enquiry, the plan was naturally extended: and the Doctor's Diſſertation forms only the FIRST PART; with obſervations on it in the form of Notes, to diſtinguiſh them from the paſſages they are intended to illuſtrate.

The SECOND ESSAY, though not pretended to be *a complete Hiſtory* of the Origin of the Art, they venture to aſſert, gives a clearer account of it than any book hitherto publiſhed in this kingdom. It contains, in as conciſe a manner as poſſible, the ſubſtance of the *Origines Typographicæ* of the very learned and ingenious Mr. GERARD MEERMAN, Penſionary of Rotterdam; and may be conſidered as the outlines of that curious publication, with ſupplementary Notes on ſome intereſting particulars. Mr. MEERMAN very clearly fixes the firſt rudiments of the art to LAURENTIUS, at Harleim; the improvement of it to GEINSFLEICH ſenior and his brother GUTENBERG, *Anglicè* GOOD-HILL, (aſſiſted by the liberality of JOHN FUST) at Mentz; and the completion of the whole to PETER SCHOEFFER, in the ſame city. The claim of Straſburgh is conſidered, and evidently overthrown.

On the whole, they by no means agree with Dr. MIDDLETON in the point of CAXTON's priority to the Oxford Book, or in the arguments adduced by the Doctor in ſupport of his opinion; any more than in the other point, of the place where the art was firſt invented and practiſed abroad. They are of opinion, that the Oxford preſs was prior to CAXTON's; and think that thoſe who have called Mr. CAXTON "the firſt printer in England," and LELAND in particular, meant that he was the firſt who practiſed the art with *fuſile types*, and conſequently "firſt brought "it to *perfection*:" which is not inconſiſtent with CORSELLIS's having printed earlier at Oxford with *ſeparate cut types in wood*, the only method he had learnt at Harleim. The ſpeaking of CAXTON, as the firſt Printer in England, in *this* ſenſe of the expreſſion, is not irreconcileable with the ſtory of CORSELLIS. But, the facts and opinions being laid before the Reader, he will judge for himſelf how far the former are ſupported by evidence, and thence will determine what degree of aſſent the latter are entitled to.

Of the APPENDIX, they will only ſay, that in the former edition the aſſiſtance of two valuable Friends contributed to make it intereſting: and though they have ſince had reaſon to lament the loſs of one of them, the preſent publication is benefited by freſh inſtances of his learned labours. The communications of ſome other ingenious Gentlemen have been attended to; and, they hope, not improperly made uſe of.

Sept. 1, 1776.

CON-

CONTENTS.

I. The Subſtance of Dr. MIDDLETON's Diſſertation on the Origin of Printing in ENGLAND.

P. 1—55

CAXTON conſtantly ſuppoſed by our Hiſtorians to have introduced Printing into England. —— 1

This ſuppoſition rendered doubtful, by the appearance of a book at Oxford (*Expoſicio Sancti Hieronymi in Symbolum Apoſtolorum* *), dated 1468. —— 2

The Oxford printer named FREDERICK CORSELLIS, proved from a record publiſhed by Mr. ATKYNS † on the ſubject. 3

A remarkable particular in this record confirmed by Mr. MEERMAN. —— —— 5

Dr. M. diſputes its authenticity. —— 7—17

The Doctor's objections anſwered, in notes C. D. E. F. G. H. I. K. ‡ —— —— ibid.

Dr. M. ſuppoſes the Oxford book to have been printed with a wrong date, as ſeveral have been in other places, either by miſtake or deſign. —— 22—24

A remarkable inſtance of an eraſure, in an edition of BARTHOLOMÆUS *de proprietatibus rerum*, detected by Mr. MEERMAN. —— —— 21

All books with an earlier date than 1457 may be pronounced forgeries. —— —— 22

* A ſpecimen of the types may be ſeen in AMES, p. 437.

† Mr. GRANGER, contrary to his uſual accuracy, has confounded this publication of ATKYNS with PALMER's Hiſtory of Printing. See vol. iv. 8vo. p. 75.

‡ This point is again treated of, p. 163, 164.

The

The Chinese mode of Printing * invented in 930. 23
Dr. M. supports his opinion by the mistake of a numeral in a book printed at Cambridge in 1734. —— 24
Curious remarks on that passage, from "The Weekly Miscellany." —— —— ibid.
Account of the first use of Signatures. —— 27 26
In which Dr. M. is mistaken. —— —— ibid.
Dr. M. supposes further, that the date of the Oxford book is a false one, as no other appeared from that press for eleven years. —— —— 29
This interval probably accounted for. —— ibid.
A list of books printed at Oxford before 1500. 30
The date of one by THEODORIC ROOD, computed by Olympiads. —— —— 31
Dr. M's remarks on the Olympiads and Lustrums of the Romans. —— —— 32
In which he is mistaken. —— —— ibid.
As he is also in the interpretation of part of the colophon in this book. —— —— 36—38
Two Printers in London much earlier than our writers have imagined. —— —— 39
Printing very early practised by the School-master of St. Alban's †. —— —— 40

A mis-

* "An Enquiry into the Origin of Printing in Europe, by a Lover "of Art, 1752," 8vo. relates principally to the Wooden Blocks used in printing *Linen*; and to an improvement made in that branch by Mr. JACKSON of Battersea, who had studied at Venice the works of the most celebrated Artists.

† In PALMER's History of Printing, p. 327, mention is made of a *Book of Miscellanies*; in the first leaf of which is an account of two books printed at St. Alban's, viz. the Book in which the observations are written; and the *Bokys of Haukyng and Huntyng*, described hereafter, p. 42. These observations Mr. PALMER has printed; and adds at the end, "Thus far we have copied from my Lord's manuscript notes." Mr. MERMAN (vol. I. p. 142.) remarks on this passage, "Re penitus "examinatâ, varia sunt, quæ eandem narrationem plusquam suspectam, "imo falsam reddant. Primum est, quod ipsa annotatio evincat, eam "non deberi peritissimo PEMBROKIÆ Comiti, ut persuadere lectoribus

A mistake of Mr. STRYPE's pointed out by Dr. M. 41
Further proofs of CAXTON's being the first Printer in England. 42
This not irreconcileable with the story of CORSELLIS. 43
CAXTON's first book was the *Recule of the Histories of Troye.* 47
He is supposed to have been an assistant in the printing of BARTHOLOMÆUS *de proprietatibus rerum* at Cologn in 1470. 49
The date in this book a false one. ibid.
He was an apprentice to a mercer. 50
Spent 30 years beyond seas in merchandizing. ibid.
Employed in a public capacity by EDWARD IV. ibid.
His books were printed in Westminster Abbey, under the patronage of Abbot MILLING, not (as has been supposed) of ISLIP. 52
Mr. M. accuses ECHARD of a mistake, in fixing the beginning of EDWARD the First's reign. 53
The Historian vindicated. ibid.
CAXTON said to have pursued business till 1494. 54
No longer than 1491. ibid.
Though he printed for EDWARD IV, and HENRY VII; it does not appear that he was a sworn servant and printer to the crown. 55
In the year 1504, however, we find that title assumed by PYNSON. ibid.
As it had before been by WILLIAM FANQUE. ibid.

"PALMERIUS voluit, sed alii cuidam anonymo (quippe semper in tertiâ "personâ de PEMBROKIÆ Comite loquitur, e. g. *as may be seen in my "Lord's books*, itemque *the which my Lord also has)*, quem ego ipsum "PALMERIUM, insignem, dum viveret, impostorem, inque ædibus Pem-"brokianis familiarem fuisse suspicor."—I have been informed that an assistant with PALMER in this work was PSALMANAZAR, an impostor by his own confession. That he had connexions with PALMER, appears from the particulars of his Life, written by himself, and printed since his death. W. B. 1766.

II. Mr.

II. Mr. MEERMAN's Account of the the First Invention of the Art at HARLEIM, and its Progress to MENTZ, &c.

The obscurity attending all former accounts of its origin. 56
Whence it arises. ——— —— ibid.
The honour of the invention claimed by Harleim, Mentz, and Strasburgh. ——— ——— 57
To be ascribed, in some measure, to each. ibid.
The Testimony of HADRIAN JUNIUS. ibid.
Some account of NICOLAUS GALIUS and QUIRINIUS TALESIUS, from whom JUNIUS learned what he has related. ibid.
Critical observations on the name of FAUSTUS. 59
Account of the two famous editions of TULLY's Offices. ibid.
An error of SCHMIDIUS pointed out. ——— 60
Another of MAITTAIRE's, with Dr. TAYLOR's remarks on it. ——— ——— 61
A remarkable particular in Duke LAUDERDALE's Bible, ibid.
M. DE BURE's account of these editions of TULLY. 62
The Greek quotations in them barbarously printed. 100
Remarks on JUNIUS's narrative. ——— 64
Though some particulars of it are to be set aside, it is true as to the main fact. ——— —— ibid.
LAURENTIUS fil. JOHANNIS the first inventor. ibid.
Who proceeded, however, no farther than *separate wooden types*. ——— —— —— ibid.
His first essay was about 1430. ——— 65
He died about 1443, after having printed the *Horarium*, the *Speculum Belgicum*, and two different editions of *Donatus*. 65—70
SCRIVERIUS's account of the invention a little different from that of JUNIUS. ——— 65
A description of the *Horarium*. ——— 66
When *direction-words*, *folios*, and *running-titles*, were respectively introduced. ——— ——— ibid.
ULRIC ZELL the first printer at Cologn. —— 67

Printing

Printing esteemed a reputable employment, and no derogation to nobility. — — 69
Coat-armour granted to the *Typothetæ* and *Typographi*. ibid.
A summary account of the life of LAURENTIUS. 69—72
JUNIUS's account of the robbery committed by a servant of LAURENTIUS. — — 72
An inquiry who the guilty person was. — 74
Proved to be JOHN GEINSFLEICH senior. — 76—78
There were two brothers of the name of JOHN GEINSFLEICH; the youngest distinguished by the name of GUTENBERG. 76
The character of the latter. — — ibid.
GEINSFLEICH senior, the *first* printer in Mentz, published, in 1442, ALEXANDRI GALLI *Doctrinale* and PETRI HISPANI *Tractatus*. — 79
These tracts used in schools in ERASMUS's young days. ibid.
Many curious specimens of early printing discovered by Mr. MEERMAN, unnoticed by former writers. — 80
Particularly *two editions* of the Grammar of ALEXANDER, one of them shewn to him by Mr. BRYANT in the Sunderland Library at Blenheim, printed at Florence *before* 1472. — — ibid.
GEINSFLEICH at first used *wooden types*, cut after the mode of those which he had stolen. — 84
In 1443, he entered into partnership with FUST (who supplied money), MEIDENBACHIUS, and others. 85
In 1444, they were joined by GUTENBERG. — ibid.
The latter, by the assistance of his brother, first invented *cut metal types*. — — ibid.
With which, in 1450, they printed the *earliest* edition of the Bible, which was seven or eight years completing. 86
M. DE BURE's account of that Bible. — 165
This not the edition which FUST sold in Paris as a manuscript. — — 86. 166
The partnership dissolved; and a new one entered into between FUST and GUTENBERG. — 86
This latter partnership dissolved in 1455. — ibid.

A magnificent edition of the *Psalter* published in 1457, by FUST and SCHOEFFER. 86
Another edition of it in 1459. 167
A third in 1490. 93. 174
A printing-office opened by GUTENBERG at Mentz. 87
Who printed, in 1460, the *Catholicon* JO. DE JANUA. ibid.
Account of this *Catholicon*, and of a curious *Vocabulary* printed at Alta Villa in 1469. ibid.
Dr. MEAD, Mr. WEST, and Dr. ASKEW, had each a copy of it. 88
GUTENBERG used none but *wooden* or *cast metal types*. ibid.
The completing of the art is owing to PETER SCHOEFFER, the servant and son-in-law of FUST, who invented a mode of casting the *types* in matrices. 19
And was probably the first engraver on *copper plates*. ibid.
TRITHEMIUS's narrative of the invention. ibid.
A correction of Mr. MERMAN's, in a passage of this narrative; with remarks on the correction. 90. 167
A further account of the invention, by JO. FRID. FAUSTUS. 91
JOHN SCHOEFFER's account of it. 91
Who was mistaken in his mother's name. 91. 168
The first book printed with the improved types was DURANDI *Rationale*, in 1459. 91
Dr. ASKEW's fine copy of that work sold for 61 l. 93
From this year to 1466, many other books were printed by FUST and SCHOEFFER. ibid.
More copies usually printed on vellum than on paper. ibid.
In 1472 SCHOEFFER was in partnership with CONRAD HENLIF, a kinsman of his master FUST. ibid.
SCHOEFFER continued to print many books till 1490. ibid.
The claim of *Strasburgh* fairly considered. 93—99
GUTENBERG attempted in vain to accomplish the art in that city. 94. 174
The first actual printers there were MENTELIUS and EGGESTANIUS, from whom no books appear till after the dispersion of the Mentz Printers in 1462. 96
From this period Printing spread rapidly through Europe. ibid.

At

At Constantinople in 1490. —— 96
In Asia *, Africa, and America, in the middle of the next century. —— —— ibid.
In Russia, about 1560 †. —— —— ibid.
In Iceland, on the authority of Mr. BRYANT, 1612. 97
The notion of Printing being invented at Strasburgh accounted for. —— —— ibid.
JOHN SCHOEFFER's duplicity, in ascribing the invention to his grandfather FUST. —— —— 98

APPENDIX.

No I.

On the first-printed Greek Books. 102—107
The first essays were a few Sentences of TULLY's *Offices*, at Mentz, 1465, which were miserably incorrect. 102
In the same year, some quotations in LACTANTIUS were neatly printed *in monasterio Sublacensi*. —— ibid.
A Semi-gothic type first used in this edition of LACTANTIUS; the characters having till then been uniformly Gothic, whence our Black. — ibid.
The Roman type, when, where, and by whom, first used. ibid.
A beautiful edition of AULUS GELLIUS, in 1469. ibid.
The printers of it almost ruined, by not being able to sell the copies of the books they printed. —— ibid.
Their petition, presented to the Pope. —— ibid.
The first whole Greek book was the Grammar of CONSTANTINE LASCARIS, at Milan, 1476. —— ibid.

* CHEVILLIER, p. 273, mentions a book printed at Goa in 1577; and refers his Readers to some early books at Lima and Manilla. PRESTER JOHN was very anxious in 1521 to introduce it into Abyssinia; and it actually passed from Spain into Morocco in that century.

† It was at first much discountenanced in Russia: but many books were printed at Moscow early in the succeeding century; and a taste for works of learning begins now to prevail in that extensive empire.

A Greek *Psalter* printed at Milan in 1481. —— 103
And Æsop's Fables. —— —— ibid.
And a *Psalter* at Venice (also the *Batrachomyomachia*) in 1486. ibid.
Remarks on an edition of Pliny at Venice, 1469. ibid.
—— on the Venice *Psalter*. —— ibid.
Some leaves of Lascaris given by Mr. De Missy to Dr. Askew. —— —— 104
Homer was printed at Florence in 1488. —— ibid.
Isocrates, at Milan, in 1493. —— ibid.
Short account of Aldus and his edition of the Septuagint. 105
He invented the *Italic* character, and why. —— ibid.
The state of early Greek printing in France. 106
Introduced by Tissard, and brought to perfection by Henry, Robert, and Henry Stephens. — ibid.
Greek correctly printed in that kingdom sooner than has been generally supposed. —— —— ibid.
The first Greek edition of *the whole Bible* was at *Complutum*. —— —— ibid.
A passage in Maittaire, on a curious edition of the Latin Bible, vindicated against Mr. Palmer, on the authority of Dr. Taylor. —— —— 107
Mr. Palmer justified. —— —— 170
Account of another scarce edition of the Latin Bible, published by Servetus. —— —— 107

N° II.

On the first printed Hebrew Books; with Observations on some modern Editions. 109—118
The *Psalms* first printed in 1477. —— 109
The Pentateuch, in 1482. —— —— ibid.
The *Prior Prophets*, in 1484. —— ibid.
The *Posterior Prophets*, in 1486. —— ibid.
The *Hagiographia*, in 1487. —— 110
The whole Text in one volume, in 1488. ibid.

A fine

A fine copy of the *Hagiographia* (the only one at that time known of) presented by Dr. PELLET to Eaton College. 110
Another fince discovered at Rome. ——— ibid.
About the year 1520, the Jews adopted the *Masora*. 111
The whole of the *New Testament* first published in Hebrew in 1599. ——— ——— ——— 111
A *pretended* ancient Gospel of St. Matthew, with a Latin translation, in 1537. ——— ibid.
A remarkable edition of the Bible published at Mantua, in 1742. ibid.
Amazing variations in the several printed copies. 111
A Collation of the Account of the Dedication of the Temple. ——— ——— 115—117
Some account of STANISLAUS GRSEPSIUS, and the singular fate of his treatise *De multiplici siclo, et talento Hebraico*. 118

N° III.

On the first-printed Polyglotts.

The first Polyglott work (printed by PORRUS at Geneva, in 1516) described. ——— ——— 119
Some account of PORRUS. ——— ibid.
Remarks on the Septuagint version; and on the Illyrian, Gothic, Arabic, Æthiopic, Armenian, and Syriac versions. ibid.
Account of SAADIAS. ——— ——— ibid.
PORRUS the first printer of Arabic. ——— 120
2000 copies of his Psalter printed, by order of JUSTINIAN Bishop of Nebo, besides 50 on vellum. ——— ibid.
Account of POTKEN, and his *Psalter* of 1518. 121—128
Particular remarks on this *Psalter* of POTKEN, and on LE LONG's account of it. ——— ibid.
Whether ERASMUS was the first editor of Polyglott Books. ibid.
The Complutensian edition of the Bible, by Cardinal XIMENES, published in 1522. ——— 128
A Polyglott Pentateuch at Constantinople, in 1546. 129

Another,

Another, at the same place, in 1544. — 130
The Royal or Spanish Polyglott, 1562—1572. — ibid.
Remark of Dr. KENNICOTT on this edition. — ibid.
Heidelberg Polyglott, 1586. — — 131
The edition of WOLDERUS, in 1596. — 132
Remarks on it. — — ibid.
The Polyglott of HUTTERUS, 1599. — ibid.
Remarks on it. — — ibid.
LE JAY's Polyglott, 1645. — — 133
Bishop WALTON's, 1657. — — ibid.
Some account of its contents. — 134
Remarkable particulars relating to this edition. 134—137
A curious letter, on a compliment to the Protector, suppressed by Bishop WALTON after the Restoration. 138—140
The Hebrew and Samaritan Text, in the English Polyglott, incorrectly printed. — — 142
Remarks on some errors in the Preface to it. — 144

N° IV.

A List of all the Cities and Towns in which Books are known to have been published with Names and Dates in the FIFTEENTH CENTURY; with the Date of the first Book, and (as far as can be discovered) the Name of the FIRST PRINTER, in each Place. Extracted principally from MAITTAIRE's Annales Typographici Tomi Primi Pars Posterior, *Amst.* 1733, p. 187, & seqq. 145—151
Remarks on the earliest edition of Ptolemy's Cosmography. 146
Some account of Dr. CASTELL. — 158

N° V.

On the COMPLUTENSIAN Polyglott, an unfinished Essay by Mr. DE MISSY. — — 159—162
The singular fate of the *first* volume of that work. 162

N° VI.

No. VI.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS.

Queen MARY's reasons for incorporating the Company of Stationers. —— —— 163
An epitaph on NICHOLAS CORSELLIS, produced by several writers with very different views, in an argument in favour of the Oxford press. —— —— ibid.
Some account of JOHN BAGFORD. —— 164
Farther particulars of the Lambeth record. —— ibid.
M. DE BURE's account of the Mentz Bibles of 1450 and 1462. —— —— 165
A difficulty, started by that ingenious Writer, removed. 166
The Psalter of 1459 exceedingly scarce. —— 167
Farther remarks on the passage of TRITHEMIUS, quoted in p. 90. —— —— ibid.
And on the name of JOHN SCHOEFFER's mother. 168
Some particulars of the Psalters of 1481 and 1486. 169
Remark on ALDUS's Septuagint. —— ibid.
Anecdotes of the first Paris Bible, and of *Gasparini Pergamensis Epistolæ.* —— —— 170
Two books, with spurious dates, announced by OSBORNE as having been printed by CORSELLIS. —— 172
Anecdotes of some early Latin Bibles. —— 172

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

Some particulars of the inventors of *wooden pictures*, from *Idée générale d'une Collection complette d'Estampes*. 173
The first artists were those who worked for the playing-card makers. —— —— ibid.
Cards at first were only *painted paper* *. —— ibid.
The outlines of the *court-cards* are now formed from *wooden stamps*, and are afterwards coloured. —— ibid.
At what period cards are first known to have been used. ibid.
In what particulars the Leipsic Writer differs from Mr. MEERMAN. —— —— 174
His Account of the early Psalters. —— ibid.
—— —— of a curious volume of Fables. — ibid.
—— —— of *La Bible des Pauvres*, *L'Apocalypse*, and several other books on *wooden blocks*. —— 175
He will not allow LAURENTIUS COSTER to have been either an Engraver or a Printer. —— —— ibid.
MICHAEL WOLGEMUT the first Engraver whose name this Writer can ascertain. —— —— 176
His account of the polite arts in England superficial. ibid.

* The *common cards* still remain so: they are not printed at all; the *red* or *black* marks on them, respectively, being laid on with a brush.

THE

ESSAY I.

The ORIGIN of PRINTING;

BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF

Dr. MIDDLETON'S Dissertation, A.D. 1735.

WITH REMARKS.

IT was a constant opinion, delivered down by our historians, as hath been observed by Dr. MIDDLETON, that the ART OF PRINTING was introduced and first practised in England by WILLIAM CAXTON, a mercer and citizen of London; who, by his travels abroad, and a residence of many years in Holland, Flanders, and Germany, in the affairs of trade, had an opportunity of informing himself of the whole method and process of the art; and by the encouragement of the great, and particularly of the abbot of Westminster, first set up a press in that abbey, and began to print books soon after the year 1471.

This was the tradition of our writers; till a book, which had scarce been observed before the Restoration, was then taken notice of by the curious, with a date of its impression from Oxford, anno 1468, and

was considered immediately as a clear proof and monument of the exercise of printing in that university several years before Caxton began to deal in it.

The book, which is in the public library at Cambridge, is a small volume of forty-one leaves in quarto, with this title; "Exposicio Sancti Jeronimi in Simbolum Apostolorum ad Papam Laurentium:" and at "the end, Explicit exposicio, &c. Impressa Oxonie, & finita Anno Domini M.CCCC.LXVIII. XVII die Decembris."

The appearance of this book has robbed Caxton of a glory that he had long possessed, of being the author of printing to this kingdom; and Oxford ever since carried the honour of the first press. The only difficulty was, to account for the silence of history in an event so memorable, and the want of any memorial in the university itself, concerning the establishment of a new art amongst them, of such use and benefit to learning. But this likewise has been cleared up, by the discovery of a record, which had lain obscure and unknown at Lambeth-house, in the Register of the See of Canterbury, and gives a narrative of the whole transaction, drawn up at the very time.

An account of this record was first published in a thin quarto volume, in English; with this title: "The Original and Growth of PRINTING, collected out of History and the Records of this Kingdome: wherein is also demonstrated, that Printing appertaineth to the Prerogative Royal; and is a Flower of the Crown of

of England. By Richard Atkyns, esq.—Whitehall, April the 25, 1664. By order and appointment of the right honourable Mr. Secretary Morrice, let this be printed. THO. RYCAUT. London: Printed by John Streater, for the Author. 1664." 4to.

It sets forth in short [A], "That as soon as the art of printing made some noise in Europe, Thomas Bourchier, archbishop of Canterbury, moved the then king (Henry VI.) to use all possible means for procuring a printing-mold (for so it was there called) to be brought into this kingdom. The king (a good man, and much given to works of this nature) readily hearkened to the motion; and, taking private advice how to effect his design, concluded it could not be brought about without great secrecy, and a considerable sum of money given to such person or persons as would draw off some of the workmen of Harleim in Holland, where John Guthenberg had newly invented it, and was himself personally at work. It was resolved, that less than one thousand marks would not produce the desired effect; towards which sum the said archbishop presented the king three hundred marks. The money being now prepared, the management of the design was committed

[A] Dr. Middleton having printed only a very small extract from this book of Mr. Atkyns, it was thought proper to lay the substance of it more fully before the reader, from Maittaire's Annales Typographicæ, vol. i. p. 28 —Palmer has also given a particular account of it, Hist. of Printing, p. 314. B.

to Mr. Robert Turnour; who then was of the robes to the king, and a perſon moſt in favour with him of any of his condition. Mr. Turnour took to his aſſiſtance Mr. Caxton, a citizen of good abilities, who traded much into Holland; which was a creditable pretence, as well for his going, as ſtay in the Low Countries. Mr. Turnour was in diſguiſe (his beard and hair ſhaven quite off); but Mr. Caxton appeared known and public. They, having received the ſaid ſum of one thouſand marks, went firſt to Amſterdam, then to Leyden, not daring to enter Harleim itſelf; for the town was very jealous, having impriſoned and apprehended divers perſons, who came from other parts for the ſame purpoſe. They ſtaid, till they had ſpent the whole thouſand marks in gifts and expences: ſo as the king was fain to ſend five hundred marks more, Mr. Turnour having written to the king, that he had almoſt done his work; a bargain (as he ſaid) being ſtruck betwixt him and two Hollanders, for bringing-off one of the under-workmen, whoſe name was Frederick Corſells (or rather Corſellis), who late one night ſtole from his fellows in diſguiſe into a veſſel prepared before for that purpoſe; and ſo, the wind favouring the deſign, brought him ſafe to London. It was not thought ſo prudent to ſet him on work at London: but, by the archbiſhop's means (who had been vice-chancellor and afterwards chancellor of the univerſity of Oxon), Corſellis was carried with a guard to Oxon: which guard conſtantly watched, to prevent Corſellis from any poſ-

ſible

ſible eſcape, till he had made good his promiſe in teaching them how to print. So that at Oxford printing was firſt ſet up in England, which was before there was any printing-preſs or printer in France, Spain, Italy, or Germany (except the city of Mentz), which claims ſeniority, as to printing, even of Harleim itſelf, calling her city, "Urbem Moguntinam artis typographicæ inventricem primam," though it is known to be otherwiſe; that city gaining the art by the brother of one of the workmen of Harleim, who had learnt it at home of his brother, and after ſet up for himſelf at Mentz [B]. This preſs at Oxon was at leaſt ten years before there was any printing in Europe, except at Harleim and Mentz, where it was but new-born. This preſs at Oxford was afterwards found inconvenient, to be the ſole printing-place of England; as being too far from London and the ſea. Wherefore the king ſet up a preſs at St. Alban's, and another in the city of Weſtminſter; where they printed ſeveral books of *divinity* and

[B] This circumſtance is urged as a great confirmation of the authority of this narration. The fact here aſſerted has been proved to be true, viz. that there were two brothers, JOHN GEINSFLEISCH ſenior and junior, the firſt of whom practiſed this art on ſeparate wooden types at Harleim, and both of them at Mentz. See p. 77.—This opinion is ſo contrary to what all the Engliſh hiſtorians relate, as Fabian, Hollingſhed, Stow, Baker, &c. and Caxton himſelf, that the author muſt have had his information from ſome one who took it from the moſt authentic monuments. MEERMAN, vol. ii. p. 30. N.

phyſic;

physic; *for the king* (for reasons best known to himself and council) *permitted then no law-books to be printed*; nor did any printer exercise that art, but only such as were the king's sworn servants; *the king himself having the price and emolument for printing books.*—By this means the art grew so famous, that anno primo Ric. III. c. 9, when an act of parliament was made for restraint of aliens from using any handicrafts here (except as servants to natives), a special proviso was inserted, that strangers might bring-in printed or written books, to sell at their pleasure, and exercise the art of printing here, notwithstanding that act: so in that space of forty or fifty years, by the indulgence of Edward IV, Edward V, Richard III, Henry VII, and Henry VIII, the English proved so good proficients in printing, and grew so numerous, as to furnish the kingdom with books; and so skilful, as to print them as well as any beyond the seas; as appears by the act 25 Henry VIII, cap. 15, which abrogates the said proviso for that reason. And it was further enacted in the said statute, that if any person bought foreign books bound, he should pay 6*s.* 8*d.* *per* book. And it was further provided and enacted, that in case the said printers or sellers of books were unreasonable in their prices, they should be moderated by the lord chancellor, lord treasurer, the two lords chief justices, or any two of them; who also had power to fine them 3*s.* 4*d.* for every book, whose price should be enhanced.—But when they were by charter corporated

rated with *book-binders*, *book-sellers*, and *founders of letters*, 3 and 4 Philip and Mary, and called THE COMPANY OF STATIONERS—they kickt against the power that gave them life, &c.—Queen Elizabeth, the first year of her reign, grants by patent *the privilege of sole printing all books that touch or concern the common laws of England*, to Tottel a servant to her majesty, who kept it intire to his death; after him, to one Yest Weirt, another servant to her majesty; after him, to Weight and Norton; and after them, king James grants the same privilege to More, one of the signet; which grant continues to this day, &c." p. 163

From the authority of this record (says Dr. M.), all our later writers declare Corsellis to be the first printer in England; Mr. Anthony Wood, the learned Mr. Maittaire, Palmer, and one John Bagford, an industrious man, who had published proposals for an History of Printing (Phil. Transf. for April, 1707); and whose manuscript papers were communicated to me by my worthy and learned friend Mr. Baker: but it is strange that a piece so fabulous, and carrying such evident marks of forgery, could impose upon men so knowing and inquisitive. p. 163 p. 164

For, first; the fact is laid quite wrong as to time; near the end of Henry the Sixth's reign, in the very heat of the civil wars; when it is not credible that a prince, struggling for life as well as his crown, should have leisure or disposition to attend to a project that could hardly be thought of, much less executed, in

times of ſuch calamity [C]. The printer, it is ſaid, was graciouſly received by the king, made one of his ſworn ſervants, and ſent down to Oxford with a guard, &c. all which muſt have paſſed before the year MCCCCLIX: for Edward IV, was proclaimed in London, in the end of it, according to our computation, on the 4th of March, and crowned about the Midſummer following (ſee Caxton's Chronicle) [D]; and

[C] But this king, after he had laid the foundations for two of the greateſt ſeminaries of literature in England, Eaton and King's College, Cambridge, beſtowed his royal munificence to two colleges in Oxford, amidſt all his troubles. See MEERMAN, vol. ii. p. 32. B.

[D] Whatever Caxton's Chronicle may ſay, we have a much greater authority for fixing the beginning of king Edward's reign in MCCCCLX-I, i. e. a year later than Dr. Middleton does. The firſt inſtrument in Rymer's Conventiones, &c. in this king's reign, begins thus: "Mem. quod die Martis, decimo die Martii, anno regni regis Edw. primo." Now in the year MCCCCLX-I, the tenth of March fell upon a Tueſday; but in MCCCCLIX-LX, on a Monday. This miſtake indeed of Dr. Middleton's is happily a confirmation of his own hypotheſis. A tranſpoſition of a numeral in Caxton's Chronicle (Mar. MCCCCLIX for MCCCCLXI) made him antedate the reign of Edward IV; as the omiſſion of x in the Expoſitio Hieronymi, printed at Oxford, is ſuppoſed to have made the publick antedate the beginning of printing there. But that Univerſity needs no ſuch ſupport: though Dr. M. does. Had he lived to ſuperintend the collection of his works (publiſhed in 1752), he might poſſibly have corrected this miſtake, which was firſt pointed out in the Grub-ſtreet Journal, March 20, 1735. B.

yet

yet we have no fruit of all this labour and expence till ten years after, when the little book, described above, is supposed to have been published from that press.

Secondly; the silence of Caxton, concerning a fact in which he is said to be a principal actor, is a sufficient confutation of it: for it was a constant custom with him, in the prefaces or conclusions of his works, to give an historical account of all his labours and transactions, as far as they concerned the publishing and printing of books. And, what is still stronger, in the Continuation of the Polychronicon, compiled by himself, and carried down to the end of Henry the Sixth's reign, he makes no mention of the expedition in quest of a Printer; which he could not have omitted, had it been true: whilst in the same book he takes notice of the invention and beginning of Printing in the city of Mentz [E]; which I shall make some use of by and by.

There is a further circumstance in Caxton's history, that seems inconsistent with the record; for we find him

[E] As Caxton makes no mention in his Polychronicon of his *expedition in quest of a Printer*; so neither does he of his *bringing the art first into England*, which it is as much a wonder he should omit as the other. And as to his saying that *the invention of Printing was at Mentz*, he means, of printing on *fusile* separate types. In this he copies, as many others have, from the *Fasciculus Temporum*; a work

 written

him still beyond sea, about twelve years after the supposed transaction, "learning with great charge and trouble the art of printing" (Recule of the Histories of Troye, in the end of the 2d and 3d books); which he might have done with ease at home, if he had got Corsellis into his hands, as the record imports, so many years before: but he probably learnt it at Cologn, where he resided in 1471,

written in 1470, by WERNERUS ROLEVINCH DE LAEN, a Carthusian Monk, a MS. copy of which was in the library of Gerard Jo. Vossius (See lib. iii. *de Histor. Latin.* c. 6,); and afterwards continued to the year 1474, when it was first printed at Cologn, *typis Arnoldi ter Huernen*. It was re-published in 1481, by HEINRICUS WIRCZBURG DE VACH, a Cluniac Monk, without mentioning the name either of the printer or of the place of publication. We are told, indeed, in a colophon, that the book was published *sub Lodovico Gruerte Comite magnifico*; but, as the country whence this illustrious nobleman assumed his title was unknown to the learned editor of the *Origines Typographicæ*, it will be no easy task for an Englishman to discover it: nor is it of much consequence; as this edition, though somewhat enlarged, was miserably interpolated throughout, and particularly so in the account of the invention of Printing.—It is plain, however, that Caxton had one at least, or more probably both of these editions before him, when he wrote his Continuation of the *Polychronicon*, as he mentions this work in his preface, and adopts the sentiments of its editor. (See MEERMAN, vol. ii. p. 37. and his *Documenta*, N° VII, XXIV, and XXV.). N.

(Recule,

(Recule, &c. ibid.), and whence books had been first printed with date, the year before [F].

To the silence of Caxton, we may add that of the Dutch writers: for it is very strange, as Mr. Chevillier observes, if the story of the record be true, "That Adrian Junius, who has collected all the groundless ones that favour the pretensions of Harleim, should never have heard of it." (L'Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris, c. i. p. 25.)

[F] Caxton tells us, in the preface to *The History of Troye*, that he began that translation March 1, 1468, at Bruges; that he proceeded on with it at Ghent; that he finished it at Cologn, 1471; and printed it, probably, in that city with his own types. He was thirty years abroad, chiefly in Holland; and lived in the court of Margaret duchess of Burgundy, sister of our Edward IV. It was therefore much easier to print his book at Cologn, than to cross the sea to learn the art at Oxford. But further, there was a special occasion for his printing it abroad. Corsellis had brought over so far the art of printing as he had learnt it at Harleim, which was the method of printing on *wooden separate* types, having the face of the letter cut upon them. But the art of *casting* metal types being divulged in 1462 by the workmen of Mentz, Caxton thought proper to learn that advantageous branch before he returned to England. This method of casting the types was such an improvement, that they looked on it as the *original* of printing; and Caxton, as most others do, ascribes that to *Mentz*.—Caxton was an assistant with Turner in getting off *Corsellis*; but it is no where supposed that he came with him into *England*. See MEERMAN, vol. ii. p. 34. B.

But thirdly; the most direct and internal proof of its forgery, is its ascribing the origin of Printing to Harleim; "where John Guttemberg, the inventor, is said to have been personally at work when Corsellis was brought away, and the art itself to have been first carried to Mentz by a brother of one of Guttemberg's workmen [G]:" for it is certain beyond all doubt, that Printing was first invented and propagated from Mentz. Caxton's testimony seems alone to be decisive; who, in the Continuation of the Polychronicon, fol. 433 [H], says, "About this time (viz. anno 1455) the crafte of emprynting was first found in Mogounce in Almayne, &c." He was abroad in the very country, and at the time, when the first project and thought of it began, and the rudest essays of it were attempted; where he continued for thirty years, viz. from 1441 to 1471: and, as he was particularly curious and inquisitive after this new art, of which he was endeavouring to get a perfect information, he could not be ignorant of the place where it was first exercised. This confutes what Palmer conjectures, to confirm the credit of the record, "That the compiler might take up with the common report, that passed current at the time in Holland, in favour of Harleim; or probably re-

[G] See the words of the record as printed above, p. 5.

[H] The testimony of Caxton will perhaps not appear so very DECISIVE as Dr. M. imagines, if the circumstances mentioned above, in the note [E], p. 9, 10, are candidly considered. And see the Second Essay, *passim*. N.

ceive

ceive it from Caxton himself;" (Hist. of Printing, book iii. p. 318:) for it does not appear that there was any such report at the time, nor many years after; and Caxton, we see, was better informed from his own knowledge; and, had Palmer been equally curious, he could not have been ignorant of this testimony of his in the very case.

Besides the evidence of Caxton, we have another contemporary authority, from the Black Book, or Register of the Garter, published by Mr. Anstis, where, in the thirty-fifth year of Henry VI, anno 1457, it is said, "In this year of our most pious king, the art of printing bookes first began at Mentz, a famous city of Germany." Hist. of Garter, vol. ii. p. 161.

Fabian likewise, the writer of the Chronicle, an author of good credit, who lived at the same time with Caxton, though some years younger, says, "This yere, (viz. 35 Henry VI,) after the opynyon of dyverse wryters, began in a citie of Almaine, named Mogunce, the crafte of empryntynge bokys, which sen that tyme hath had wonderful encreace." These three testimonies have not been produced before, that I know of; two of them were communicated to me by Mr. Baker, who of all men is the most able, as well as the most willing, to give information in every point of curious and uncommon history.

I need not pursue this question any farther; the testimonies commonly alledged in it may be seen in Mr. Maittaire, Palmer, &c. I shall only observe, that

we

we have full and authentic evidence for the cause of Mentz; in an edition of Livy from that place, anno 1518, by John Scheffer, the son of Peter, the partner and son-in-law of John Faust: where the PATENT OR PRIVILEGE GRANTED BY THE EMPEROR TO THE PRINTER; the prefatory epistle of Erasmus; the epistle dedicatory to the prince by Ulrich Hutten; the epistle to the reader of the two learned men who had the care of the edition; all concur in asserting the origin of the art to that city, and the invention and first exercise of it to Faust: and Erasmus particularly, who was a Dutchman, would not have *decided against* [l] his own

[l] It must be allowed that the edition of Livy (which, by the bye, Dr. Middleton has antedated, it being published in 1519) is indeed *a full and authentic evidence for the cause of Mentz.* The several authorities Dr. Middleton has referred to are preserved by Mr. Meerman, in his *Documenta*, N° XLVII. The emperor's patent, dated Dec. 9, 1518, begins thus: "MAXIMILIANUS, &c. honesto nostro, & sacri Imperii fideli nobis dilecto JOHANNI SCHEEFER, Chalchographo Moguntino, gratiam nostram Cæsaream, & omne bonum. Cum, sicut docti & moniti sumus fide dignorum testimonio, ingeniosum Chalcographiæ, AUTHORE AVO TUO, inventum, felicibus incrementis, in universum orbem promanaverit, &c." It is said by ULRICH HUTTEN, in the dedication to *Albert* the archbishop, "Si vel locum voluit LIVIUS aliquem suo decorare egressu, quem debuit urbi, ARTIS omnium, quæ usque sunt, aut unquam fuerunt, PRÆSTANTISSIMÆ INVENTRICI ac ALUMNÆ (IMPRESSORIAM puto, quam hæc dedit) præferre?"—In the epistle to the reader by NICHOLAS CARBACHIUS,

own country, had there been any ground for the claim of Harleim.

But to return to the Lambeth record: as it was *never heard of before the publication of Atkins's book*, so it has never since been seen or produced by any man; though the Registers of Canterbury have on many occasions been diligently and particularly searched for it. They were examined without doubt very carefully by archbishop Parker, for the compiling his Antiquities of the British Church; where, in the life of Thomas Bourchier, though he congratulates that age on the noble and useful invention of

BACHIUS, Jo. SCHEFFER is mentioned as "Chalcographus, à cujus avo Chalcographe IN HAC PRIMUM URBE INVENTA exercitaque est." ERASMUS's words are, "Quorum princeps fuisse FERTUR JOHANNES FAUST, avus ejus, cui LIVIUM hunc debemus; ut hoc egregium decus partim ad JOHANNEM SCHEFFER, velut *hereditarie jure* devolvatur, partim ad MOGUNTIACÆ civitatis gloriam pertineat." And Fabian, before him, says, AFTER THE OPINION OF DIVERSE WRITERS. So that it is probable there was *some report* (whether upon Harleim's claiming the honour of printing on wooden types first, or not) that Mentz was not the place where Printing was first invented, though the united force of the above authentic testimonies might seem to confirm its claim to that honour.—It may be nearer the truth, if we suppose (to apply the words of ULRICH HUTTEN a little differently from his intention) that HARLEIM was the *inventrix*, and *Mentz* the *alumna* of PRINTING; though the improvements made in the art by the latter were so very considerable, as to deserve the name of a new invention. N.

Printing,

Printing, yet he is silent as to the introduction of it into England by the endeavours of that archbishop; nay, his giving the honour of the invention to Strasburg clearly shews that he knew nothing of the story of Corsellis conveyed from Harleim, and that the record was not in being in his time. Palmer himself owns, "That it is not to be found there now; for that the late earl of Pembroke assured him, that he had employed a person for some time to search for it, but in vain." (Hist. of Printing, p. 314.). On these grounds we may pronounce the record to be a forgery; though all the writers above-mentioned take pains to support its credit, and call it an authentic piece. (See Contents, p. vi.)

Atkins, who by his manner of writing seems to have been *a bold and vain man*, might possibly be *the inventor*; for he had an interest in imposing it upon the world, in order to confirm the argument of his book, that *Printing was of the Prerogative Royal*; in opposition to the *Company of Stationers*, with whom he was engaged in an expensive suit of law, in defence of the *King's Patents*, under which he claimed *some exclusive powers of Printing*. For he tells us, p. 3, "That, upon considering the thing, he could not but think that a public person, more eminent than a mercer, and a public purse, must needs be concerned in so public a good: and the more he considered, the more inquisitive he was to find out the truth." So that he had formed his hypothesis before he had found his record; which he published, he says, "as a friend

a friend to truth; not to suffer one man to be entitled to the worthy atchievements of another; and as a friend to himself, not to lose one of his best arguments of entitling the King to this Art." But, if Atkins was not himself the contriver, he was imposed upon at least by some more crafty; who imagined that his interest in the cause, and the warmth that he shewed in prosecuting it, would induce him to swallow for genuine whatever was offered of the kind [K].

We

[K] On the other hand, is it likely that Mr. Atkins would dare to *forge* a record, to be laid before the king and council, and which his adversaries, with whom he was at law, could disprove?—(2.) He says he received this history from a person of honour, who was some time keeper of the Lambeth Library. It was easy to have confuted this evidence, if it was false, when he published it, Apr. 25, 1664.—(3.) John Bagford (who was born in England 1651, and might know Mr. Atkins, who died in 1677), in his History of Printing at Oxford, blames those who doubted of the authenticity of the Lambeth Ms.; and tells us that he knew Sir John Birkenhead had an authentic copy of it, when in 1665 [which Bagford by some mistake calls 1664, and is followed in it by Meerman] he was appointed by the house of commons to draw up a bill relating to the exercise of that art. This is confirmed by the Journals of that house, Friday, Oct. 27, 1665, vol. VIII. p. 622; where it is ordered that this Sir John Birkenhead should carry the bill on that head to the house of lords, for their consent.—The act was agreed to in the upper house on Tuesday Oct. 31, and received the royal assent on the same day; immediately after which, the parliament was prorogued. See Journals of the House of Lords, Vol. XI. p. 700.

p. 164

We have now cleared our hands of the record; but the book ſtands firm, as a monument of the exerciſe

p. 700.—It is probable then that, after Mr. Atkins had publiſhed his book in April 1664, the parliament thought proper, the next year, to inquire into *the right of the* KING'S PREROGATIVE; and that Sir John Birkenhead took care to inſpect the original, then in the cuſtody of Archbiſhop Sheldon: and, finding it not ſufficient to prove what Mr. Atkins had cited it for, made no report of the Mſ. to the houſe; but only moved, that the former law ſhould be renewed. The Mſ. was probably never returned to the proper keeper of it; but was afterwards burnt in the fire of London, Sept. 13, 1666.—(4.) That Printing was practiſed at Oxford, was a prevailing opinion long before Atkins. Bryan Twyne, in his *Apologia pro Antiquitate Academiæ Oxonienſis*, publiſhed 1608, tells us, it is ſo delivered down in *ancient writings*; having heard probably of this Lambeth Mſ. And king Charles I, in his letters patent to the Univerſity of Oxford, March 5, in the eleventh of his reign, 1635, mentions Printing as brought to *Oxford* from abroad. As to what is objected, "that it is not likely that the preſs ſhould undergo a ten or eleven years ſleep, viz. from 1468 to 1479," it is probably urged without foundation. Corſellis might print ſeveral books without date or name of the place, as Ulric Zell did at Cologn, from 1467 to 1473, and from that time to 1494. Corſellis's name, it may be ſaid, appears not in any of his publications; nor does that of Joannes Peterſhemius. See MERRMAN, vol. I. p. 34; vol. II. p. 21—27, &c.

Further, the famous SHAKESPEARE, who was born in 1564, and died 1616, in the Second Part of Henry VI.

Act

ercise of printing in Oxford six years older than any book of Caxton with date. The fact is strong, and what

Act. iv. Sc. 7, introduces the rebel *John Cade*, thus upbraiding Lord Treasurer SAY: "Thou hast most traiterously corrupted the youth of the realm, in creating a grammar-school; and whereas before, our forefathers had no other book but the score and the tally, thou hast caused PRINTING to be used; and, contrary to the king, his crown, and dignity, thou hast built a paper-mill."—Whence now had Shakespeare this accusation against Lord SAY? We are told in the Poetical Register, vol. II. p. 231. ed. Lond. 1724, that it was from FABIAN, POL. VERGIL, HALL, HOLLINGSHED, GRAFTON, STOW, SPEED, &c. But not one of these ascribes Printing to the reign of Henry VI. On the contrary, Stow, in his Annals, printed at London, 1560, p. 686, gives it expresly to William Caxton, 1471. "The noble science of Printing was about this time found in Germany at Magunce, by one John Guthemburgus a knight. One Conradus an Almaine brought it into Rome: William Caxton of London mercer brought it into England about the yeare 1471, and first practised the same in the Abbie of St. Peter at Westminster; after which time it was likewise practised in the Abbies of St. Augustine at Canturburie, Saint Albons, and other monasteries of England." What then shall we say, that the above is an anachronism arbitrarily put into the mouth of an ignorant fellow out of Shakespeare's head? I could believe so, but that we have the record of Mr. Atkins confirming the same in K. Charles the Second's time. Shall we say, that Mr. Atkins borrowed the story from Sakespeare, and published it with some improvements of money laid out by Henry VI; from whence it

what in ordinary cases passes for certain evidence of the age of books; but in this, there are such contrary facts to balance it, and such circumstances to turn the

might be received by Charles II, as a prerogative of the crown? But this is improbable, since Shakespeare makes Lord Treasurer SAY the instrument of importing it, of whom Mr. Atkins mentions not a word. Another difference there will still be between Shakespeare and the Lambeth MS.; the Poet placing it before 1449, in which year Lord SAY was beheaded; the MS. between 1454 and 1459, when Bourchier was Archbishop. We must say then, that Lord SAY first laid the scheme, and sent some one to Harleim, though without success; but after some years it was attempted happily by Bourchier. And we must conclude, that as the generality of writers have overlooked the invention of Printing at Harleim with *wooden* types, and have ascribed it to Mentz where *metal* types were first made use of; so in England they have passed by Corsellis (or the first *Oxford Printer*, whoever he was, see the note [P], p. 24), who printed with *wooden* types at Oxford, and only mentioned Caxton as the original artist who printed with *metal* types at Westminster, See MEERMAN, vol. II. p. vii, viii.—It is strange that the learned Commentators on our great Dramatic Poet, who are so minutely particular upon less important occasions, should every one of them, Dr. JOHNSON excepted, pass by this curious passage, leaving it entirely unnoticed. And how has Dr. JOHNSON trifled, by slightly remarking, that "SHAKESPEARE is a little TOO EARLY with this accusation!"—The great Critic had undertaken to decypher obsolete words, and investigate unintelligible phrases; but never, perhaps, bestowed a thought on Caxton or Corsellis, on Mr. Atkins or the authenticity of the Lambeth Record. B. & N.

scale,

scale, that, to speak my mind freely, I take the date in question to have been falsified originally by the printer, either by design or mistake, and an x to have been dropt or omitted in the age of its impression.

Examples of the kind are common in the History of Printing. I have observed several dates altered very artfully after publication, to give them the credit of greater antiquity. They have at Harlem, in large quarto, a translation into Dutch of *Bartholomæus de proprietatibus rerum*, printed *anno* MCCCCXXXV, by Jacob Bellart: this they shew, to confirm their claim to the earliest printing, and deceive the unskilful. But Mr. Bagford, who had seen another copy with a true date, discovered the cheat; by which the L had been erased so cunningly, that it was not easy to perceive it [L]. But, besides the frauds of an after-contrivance, there are many false dates originally given by the printers; partly through design, to

[L] See Mr. Bagford's Papers.—Mr. Maittaire, Annal. Typogr. tom. I. p. 190, mentions an edition of this book at Cologn in MCCCCLXX. The copy which he had seen was in the earl of Oxford's library, and came afterwards into the hands of Mr. T. Osborn; in whose Catalogues it frequently appeared, with the date MCCCCLXX. Mr. Meerman, who was convinced that this date must either be a mistake or an imposition, had the curiosity (when, in 1759, he resided at London in a public capacity) to examine Mr. Osborn's book; which proved to be the edition of MCCCCLXXXIII (which Mr. Maittaire has also taken notice of), with the four last numerals very artfully erased. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 59. N.

raise

raise the value of their works, but chiefly through negligence and blunder. There is a Bible at Augsburg, of the year 1449, where the two last figures are transposed, and should stand thus, 1494: Chevillier (Orig. de l'Imprim. de Paris, c. v. p. 96.) mentions three more; one at Paris of 1443; another at Lyons, 1446; a third at Basil, 1450; though Printing was not used in any of these places till many years after. Orlandi describes three books with the like mistake from Mentz: and Jo. Koelhoff, who first printed about the year 1470 at Cologn, has dated one of his books anno MCCCC. with a c omitted; and another, anno 1458; which Palmer (Hist. of Printing, p. 179) imputes to design, rather than mistake [M].

But

[M] Mr. Meerman, after fixing the invention of Printing beyond a doubt *in the fifteenth century*, takes notice of a German tract, *von dem Cyrurgus*, 1397. This, he observes, and some other similar instances, may beyond doubt be pronounced FORGERIES; and there will be little danger of a mistake, if we extend this assertion to all books in general that have an earlier date than MCCCCLVII, when the *Psalter* was published at Mentz, which is the first work that is known to have a date to it. See Maittaire, Annal. Typogr. tom. I. p. 2. Marchand, Hist. de l'Imprim. p. 113. Naudæus, Addit. à l'Hist. de Louis XI. p. 110.—Some writers have ascribed the origin of Printing to the East, and affixed a much earlier period to its invention; particularly P. Jovius, Hist. lib. xiv. p. 226. ed. Florent. 1550, from whom Osorius and many others have embraced the same opinion. But these have evidently confounded the European mode of PRINTING, with the *engraved tablets* which to this day are

used

But what is most to our point, is a book from the famous printer, Nicolas Jenson; of which Mr. Maittaire gave the first notice, called Decor Puellarum; printed anno MCCCCLXI. All the other works of Jenson were published from Venice between the years MCCCCLXX and MCCCCLXXX; which justly raised a suspicion, that an X had been dropt from the date of this, which ought to be advanced ten years forward; since it was not credible, that so great a master of the art, who at once invented and perfected it, could lie so many years idle and unemployed. The suspicion appeared to be well grounded, from an edition of Tully's Epistles at Venice, *the first work of another famed printer, John de Spira, anno* MCCCCLXIX [N]; who, in the four following verses, at the end of the book,

used in China. The invention of these tablets has been ascribed by many writers even to an earlier period than the commencement of the Christian æra; but is with more probability assigned, by the very accurate PHIL. COUPLET, to the year 930. The *Historia Sinensis* of ABDALLA, written in Persic in 1317, speaks of it as an art in very common use. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 16. 218, 219; vol. II. p. 186. N.

[N] And yet, in the Catalogue of the Harleian Library, vol. III. p. 321, a book is mentioned as printed at Venice a year before this of JOHN DE SPIRA, viz. *Fr. Maturantii, de componéndis versibus Hexametro et Pentametro, Opusculum*, 1468, with the following remark: "This editon of MATURANTIUS is not taken notice of by any Author; and by "the date of MCCCCLXVIII it seems to be the *first* book "printed by ROTDOLT of Venice; as also the *first* book "printed at Venice with any date, except *Decor Puellarum*, "whose date I believe to be false." B. & N.

claims

claims the honour of being the first who had printed in that city:

"Primus in Adriaca formis impressit aënis
Urbe libros Spirâ genitus de stirpe Johannes.
In reliquis sit quanta, vides, spes, lector, habenda,
Quum labor hic primus calamis superaverit artem."

It is, I know, the more current opinion, confirmed by the testimony of contemporary writers, that *Jenson was the first printer at Venice* [O]: But these verses of John de Spira, published *at the time*, as well as *the place*, in which they both lived, and *in the face of his rival Jenson*, without any contradiction from him, seem to have a weight too great to be overruled by any foreign evidence whatsoever.

But whilst I am now writing, an unexpected instance is fallen into my hands, to the support of my opinion; an *Inauguration Speech of the Woodwardian Professor, Mr. Mason*, just fresh from the press, with its date given ten years earlier than it should have been, by the omission of an x, viz. MDCCXXIV; and the very blunder exemplified in the last piece printed at Cambridge, which I suppose to have happened in the first from Oxford [P]. These

[O] Maittaire, Annal. Typ. tom. I. p. 36, &c. It. Append. ad tom. I. p. 5, 6.

[P] The following curious remarks, on this passage of Dr. Middleton, appeared in The Weekly Miscellany, Saturday, April 26, 1735, in a letter signed OXONIDES: "I think the learned author has sufficiently exposed the idle story of FREDERICK CORSELLIS, and entirely concur with him

These instances, with many more that might be collected, shew the possibility of my conjecture; and, for

him in rejecting it. But when he compliments CAXTON with the name of our First Printer, notwithstanding the authority of a book printed at *Oxford*, and dated in the year MCCCCLXVIII, I cannot go so far with him. We should not pretend to set aside the authority of *a plain date*, without very strong and cogent reasons; and I am afraid what the Doctor has in this case advanced will not appear, on examination, to carry that weight with it that he seems to imagine. There may be, and have been, mistakes and forgeries in the date both of books and of records too; but this is never allowed as a reason for suspecting such as bear no mark of either. We cannot, from a blunder in the last book printed at Cambridge, infer the like blunder in the first book printed at Oxford. Besides, the *type* used in this our Oxford edition seems to be no small proof of its antiquity. It is the *German* letter, and very nearly the same with that used by FUST [who has been supposed to be] the first Printer; whereas CAXTON and ROOD use a quite different letter, something between this *German* and our old *English* letter, which was soon after introduced by DE WORDE and PYNSON. Lastly, the supposed year of this edition is much about the time that the printers at Mentz dispersed, and carried the art of Printing with them to most parts of Europe. This circumstance, joined to that of the letter, inclines me to think *that one of these printers might then come over to England, and follow his profession at Oxford.* These, I must own, are only conjectural proofs, nor can we expect any other in the present case. We find most points of antiquity involved in obscurity; and, what is not

for the probability of it, the book itself affords sufficient proof: For, not to insist on, what is less material, the *neatness of the letter, and regularity of the page*, &c. above those of Caxton; it has one mark, that seems to carry the matter beyond probable, and to make it even certain, viz. *the use of signatures*, or letters of the alphabet placed at the bottom of the page, to shew the sequel of the page and leaves of each book: an improvement contrived for the direction of the bookbinders; which yet was not practised or invented at the time when this book is sup-

a little surprizing, the Art of Printing, which has given light to most other things, hides its own head in darkness.—But our ingenious Dissertator seems to think his proofs attended with more certainty. Let us then examine what he says: And first, the neatness of the letter, and the regularity of the page, prove, if any thing, the very reverse of what the Doctor asserts. The art of Printing was almost in its infancy brought to perfection; but afterwards debased by later printers, who consulted rather the cheapness, than the neatness of their work. Our learned Dissertator cannot be unacquainted with the labours of FUST and JENSON. He must know, that though other printers may have printed more correctly, yet scarce any excell them, either in the neatness of the letter, or the regularity of the page. The same may be observed in our English printers. CAXTON and ROOD were indifferently good printers: DE WORDE and PYNSON were worse; and those that follow them most abominable. This our *anonymous Oxford Printer* excells them all; and for this very reason I should judge him to be the most ancient of all." N.

posed

posed to be printed: for we find no signatures in the books of Faust or Schoeffer at Mentz, nor in the improved or beautiful impressions of John de Spira and Jenson at Venice, till several years later. We have a book in our library, that seems to fix the very time of their invention, at least in Venice; the place where the art itself received the greatest improvements: *Baldi lectura super Codic.* &c. printed by John de Colonia and *Jo. Manthen de Gherretzem, anno* MCCCCLXXIIII: it is a large and fair volume in folio, *without signatures*, till about the middle of the book, in which they are first introduced, and so continued forward: which makes it probable, that the first thought of them was suggested during the impression; for we have likewise *Lectura Bartholi super Codic.* &c. in two noble and beautiful volumes in folio, printed the year before at the same place, by Vindelin de Spira, without them: yet from this time forward they are generally found in all the works of the Venetian printers, and from them propagated to the other printers of Europe. They were used at Cologn, in 1475; at Paris, 1476; by Caxton, not before 1480: but if the discovery had been brought into England and practised at Oxford twelve years before, it is not probable that he would have printed so long at Westminster without them [Q].

Mr.

[Q] Dr. Middleton is mistaken in the time and place of the invention of signatures. They are to be found even in

Mr. Palmer indeed tells us, p. 54, 180, that Anthony Zarot was esteemed the inventor of signatures; and

very ancient MSS. which the earliest printers very studiously imitated; and they were even used in some editions from the office of Laurence Coster (whence Corsellis came), which consisted of wooden cuts; as in *Figuræ typicæ et antitypicæ Novi Testamenti:* and in some editions with metal types, as in *Gasp. Pergamensis epistolæ*, published at Paris, without a date, but printed A. D. 1470; (Maittaire, Annal. vol. I. p. 25); and in *Mammetrectus*, printed by Helias de Elouffen, at Bern in Switzerland, 1470; and in *De Tondeli visione*, at Antwerp, 1472. Venice, therefore, was not the place where they were first introduced.—They began to be used in Baldus, it seems, when the book was half finished. The printer of that book might not know, or did not think, of the use of them before. See MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 28; and Phil. Trans. vol. XXIII. N° 208. p. 1509.—OXONIDES says, "Our Dissertator lays great stress on the use of signatures. But I am afraid no certain conclusion can be drawn either from the use or non-use of these lesser improvements of Printing. They have in different places come in use at different times, and have not been continued regularly even at the same places. If Anthony Zarot used them at Milan in 1470, it is certain later printers there did not follow his example; and the like might happen also in England. But, what is more full to our purpose, we have in the Bodleian library an Æsop's Fables printed by Caxton. This is, I believe, the first book which has *the leaves numbered.* But yet this improvement, though more useful than that of the signatures, was diffused both by Caxton himself and other later printers in England.

and that they are found in a Terence printed by him at Milan in the year 1470, in which he first printed. I have not seen that Terence; and can only say, that I have observed the want of them in some later works of this, as well as of other excellent printers, of the same place. But, allowing them to be in the Terence, and Zarot the inventor, it confutes the date of our Oxford book as effectually, as if they were of later origin at Venice; as I had reason to imagine, from the testimony of all the books that I have hitherto met with.

What farther confirms my opinion is, that, from the time of the pretended date of this book, anno 1468, we have no other fruit or production from the press at Oxford for eleven years next following; and it cannot be imagined that a press, established with so much pains and expence, could be suffered to be so long idle and useless [R]: whereas, if my conjecture be admitted,

land. It is therefore not at all surprizing (if true) that the signatures, though invented by our Oxford Printer, might not immediately come into general use. And consequently, this particular carries with it no such certain or effectual confutation as our Dissertator boasts of." B. & N.

[R] To this it may be answered, in the words of Oxonides: "1st, That his books may have been lost. Our first printers, in those days of ignorance, met with but small encouragement: they printed but few books, and but few copies of those books. In after-times, when the same books were re-printed more correctly, those first editions, which

admitted, all the difficulties, that seem insuperable and inconsistent with the supposed æra of Printing there, will vanish at once: for, allowing the book to have been printed ten years later, anno 1478; then the use of signatures can be no objection: a foreign printer might import them; Caxton take them up from him; and the course of Printing and sequel of books published from Oxford will proceed regularly:

Expoficio Sancti Jeronimi in Simbolum Apostolorum. MCCCCLXXVIII. Oxonie, 1478
Leonardi Aretini in Aristot. Ethic. Comment. ib. 1479
Ægidius de Roma, &c. de peccato originali, ib. 1479

which were not as yet become curiosities, were put to common uses. This is the reason that we have so few remains of our first printers. We have only four books of Theodorick Rood, who seems by his own verses to have been a very celebrated Printer. Of John Lettou, William de Machlinia, and the School-master of St. Alban's, we have scarce any remains. If this be considered, it will not appear *impossible* that our Printer should have followed his business from 1468 to 1479, and yet Time have destroyed his intermediate works. But, 2dly, we may account still another way for this distance of time, without altering the date. The Civil Wars broke out in 1469: this might probably oblige our Oxford Printer to shut up his press; and both himself and his Readers be otherwise engaged. If this were the case, he might not return to his work again till 1479; and the next year, not meeting with that encouragement he deserved, he might remove to some other country with his types." N.

Guido

Guido de Columna de Historia Trojana, per T. R. ib. 1480

Alexandri ab Hales, &c. expoſicio ſuper 3 Librum de Animâ, per me Theod. Rood. ib. 1481

Franc. Aretini Oratoris Phalaridis Epiſtolarum e Græco in Latinum Verſio. Hoc opuſculum in Alma Univerſitate Oxoniæ, a natali Chriſtiano ducenteſima & nonageſima ſeptima Olympiade feliciter impreſſum eſt. That is, 1485

" Hoc teodoricus Rood quem Collonia miſit
Sanguine Germanus nobile p̃ſſit [1] opus.
Atque ſibi ſocius Thomas fuit Anglicus Hunté
Dii dent ut Venetos exuperare queant!
Quam Jenſon Venetos docuit Vir Gallicus artem
Ingenio didicit terra Britanna ſuo.
Celatos Veneti nobis tranſmittere libros
Cedite, nos aliis vendimus. O Veneti
Que fuerat vobis ars primum nota Latini
Eſt eadem nobis ipſa reperta prẽs [2].
Quamvis ſẽctos [3] toto canit orbe Britannos
Virgilius placẓ [4] his lingua Latina tamen [S]."

[1] preſſit [2] premens [3] ſejunctos [4] placet

Theſe

[S] The only copy of this book, that I have heard of, is in the poſſeſſion of the rev. Mr. Randolph of Deal; and the firſt notice of it was communicated by the rev. Mr. Lewis of Mergate; who, having been informed that I had drawn up this little Diſſertation, very kindly offered me the uſe of his notes and papers, that he had collected with great pains, on

These are all the books printed at Oxford before the year 1500, that we have hitherto any certain notice of. I have set down the colophon and verses of the last, because they have something curious and historical in them. I had seen one instance before of the date of a book computed by OLYMPIADS; *Ausonii Epigrammatōn libri*, &c.; printed at Venice, anno 1472, with this designation of the year at the end; "A nativitate Christi ducentesimæ nonagesimæ quintæ Olympiadis anno II;" (Maittaire, Annal. Typ. p. 98, not. [h];) where the printer, as in the present case, follows the common mistake, both of the ancients and moderns, of taking the OLYMPIAD for a term of FIVE YEARS compleat; whereas it really included but FOUR, and was celebrated every FIFTH; as the LUSTRUM likewise of the Romans [T]. In our Oxford

on *the History and Progress of English Printing to the End of Queen Elisabeth's Reign.* From the perusal of which, though I found no reason to make any alteration of moment in the present Treatise, yet I had a pleasure to observe a perfect agreement between us in the chief points on which my argument turns, and to find my own opinion confirmed by the judgment of so able an antiquary.

Dr. MIDDLETON.

[T] An *Olympiad* was undoubtedly the space of FOUR years compleat, and a *Lustrum* of FIVE. But many of the moderns have confounded them, by including each within *four* years. Selden, De Jure Nat. & Gentium, l. iii. p. 360, ed. 1725, observes the same; but takes notice that the mistake

Oxford book, the year of the Olympiad is not distinguished as in that of Venice; so that it might possibly take was common to both terms, each of them being sometimes reckoned as FOUR YEARS, sometimes as FIVE: "Persimilem in lustris & olympiadibus, quibus nunc *quinquennia*, nunc *quadriennia* tribuuntur, supputandi rationem nemo nescit."

Noris takes notice that Ovid *confounds* the space of the *Olympiad* with the *Lustrum*, Trist. IV. x. 95. "Ovidius, scribens se anno ætatis quinquagesimo exacto, in exilium deportatum, ait,

"Postque meos ortus Pisæâ vinctus olivâ
Abstulerat decies præmia victor eques;"

ubi Pisæorum quadriennes Olympiades cum Romanis Lustris confundit." Cenotaph. Pisan. p. 2. ed. 1681.

On the other hand, a *Lustrum* is supposed to contain only FOUR years, by H. Glareanus in Chronologia Dion. Halicarn. p. 759, ed. Sylburg. and by Erasmus Schmidius in his Prolegomena ad Pindarum, p. 15: "Et ab hoc annorum quatuor completorum circuitu etiam τετραέτηρις nominabatur, plane ut apud Romanos LUSTRUM, quod et ipsum erat *quatuor* annorum completorum spatium, ubi *quarto* quoque exacto anno populus Romanus lustrabatur."

The *Lustrum* is supposed to have contained only *four* years in Pliny, N. H. ii. 47: "Et est principium Lustri ejus semper intercalari anno Caniculæ ortu." But he applies the word in a borrowed sense, to express not only the periodical returns, but the cleansing office of the winds, in that respect like the *Lustrum*.

But the proper sense of these words among the ancients was, that an *Olympiad* signified FOUR years, and

possibly be printed somewhat earlier, and nearer to the rest in order of time: but, as the seventh verse seems to refer

a *Lustrum* FIVE. The first is proved by demonstrable authority, because the Grecians inserted their intercalary month of XLV days after three years of 354 days; and appointed these games *on the fourth year*, for the regular notoriety of the fact. Blondel, Rom. Cal. liv. II. c. 4; and Prid. Connect. part I. book v. p. 222. ed. fol.

There are other authorities without number: Ὀλυμπιὰς πληρῶται καὶ τέτταρας χρόνους, Diod. Sic. 44. A. ed. Rhodom.; and no one ever read of above the *fourth* year of the I, II, III, IV, or any other Olympiad. But this period of an OLYMPIAD Dr. MIDDLETON allows.

That the LUSTRUM contained *five* years is clear, I think, from undoubted testimony: in vain else would Horace have told the girl she need not shun him as being too rampant, since he was arrived at the *eighth* Lustrum, which surely is more probably at XL years of age than XXXII:

"Fuge suspicari,
Cujus OCTAVUM trepidavit ætas
Claudere LUSTRUM." Lib. II. Od. iv. 22.

So again, from Augustus's conquest of Alexandria, U. C. 724. to his victory over the Rhœti, U. C. 739 (as Dio relates, lib. LIV.), Horace describes

"Fortuna LUSTRO prospera TERTIO
Belli secundos reddidit exitus." Lib. IV. Od. xiv. 37.

Where Acron indeed supposes the LUSTRUM to be a term of only FOUR years, reckoning XII years from Augustus's first consulship to the end of the civil wars; in which he is followed, as we observed before, by Glareanus.—But, whichsoever it is, *prose writers* are express for FIVE years. Varro says, "Lustrum nominatum tempus *quinquennale* à luendo,

i. e.

refer to the ſtatute 1 Richard III, prohibiting the Italians from importing and ſelling their wares in England

i. e. ſolvendo, quod *quinto* quoque *anno* vectigalia et tributa per cenſores ſolvebantur."—See likewiſe Horace, l. IV. Od. i. ver. 6.

It muſt be owned, Antonius Nebriſſenſis, in his Quinquagena, c. xx. printed in the Critici Sacri, tom. IX. ed. Amſt. labours to prove a *Luſtrum* to be only FOUR years, from two or three paſſages in the Roman poets, who ſometimes take the liberty of ſo applying it; but with much better authority is it fixed to be FIVE years by Jo. Caſtellio, in his Variæ Lectiones, c. xix. See Fax Artium, tom. IV. c. 19.

Dr. Middleton reſumes this ſubject in his *Roman Senate*, A. D. 1747, part I. p. 107, 8vo. [vol. III. p. 429, of the 4to edition of his works]; and ſays, that "as the cenſus was ſuppoſed to be celebrated every *fifth* year; and as it was accompanied always by a *Luſtration* of the people; ſo the word *Luſtrum* has *conſtantly been taken, both by ancients and moderns*, for a term of FIVE years." Yet we ſhall find no good ground for fixing ſo preciſe a ſignification to it; but, on the contrary, that the Cenſus and Luſtrum were, for the moſt part, held irregularly and uncertainly, at very different and various intervals of time, as the particular exigencies of the ſtate required."—But, 1. We have ſeen it was "NOT conſtantly taken for a term of FIVE years both by ancients and moderns;" ſo that this ſenſe of FOUR years is not SOLELY Dr. MIDDLETON's, though he will ſuffer no one elſe to ſhare in the honour of it. 2. If it was *conſtantly* taken ſo both by *ancients* and *moderns*, one would think *that* ſhould determine the period; though the Romans might, for particular exigencies of ſtate, vary from the preſcribed

England by retail, &c. excepting books written or printed; which act passed in 1483; so it could not be printed before that year. The third verse rescues from oblivion the name of an English printer, THOMAS HUNTE, not mentioned before by any of our English writers, nor discovered in any other book. But what I take for the most remarkable, and lay the greatest stress upon, is, that, in the sixth verse, "the art and use of Printing is affirmed to have been first set on foot and practised in this island by our own countrymen [U]:" which must consequently have

time of the ceremony. 3. Mr. Hooke has shewn (Observations, in Answer to L'Abbé Vertot, &c. p. 153, 157), "that there is good reason to believe, the seven first Lustrums, after the establishment of the commonwealth, were regularly held every *five* years: consequently that there was sufficient ground in FACT for fixing the term of FIVE years to the word *Lustrum*.—For the first SEVEN Lustrums, under the consuls, will carry us through an interval of exactly *thirty-five* years, from A. U. 245."—The Doctor had no occasion to have laboured this point, here at least; but his plenary knowledge in the Roman constitution would not suffer him to bear any contradiction in it. B.

[U] We shall make no apology for introducing one more remark from OXONIDES: "Dr. Middleton's translation of the sixth verse is a sense, I believe, Roop never thought of. His verses seem rather designed to extol *his own press* than that of Caxton; and the meaning I take to be no more than this, that the Art of Printing, for which the Venetians, and particularly Jenson, had been so famous, was now

have a reference to CAXTON; who has no rival of this country to dispute the honour with him. And so we are furnished at last, from Oxford itself, with a testimony that overthrows the date of their own book.

THEODORIC ROOD, we see, came from Cologn (where Caxton had resided many years, and instructed himself in the Art of Printing) in 1471: and, being so well acquainted with the place, and particularly the printers of it, might probably be the instrument of bringing over this or any other printer a year or two before (if there really was any such) to be

now practised with equal success in England. Our Dissertator's quotation from CAXTON will prove but little, unless he can shew, that no printer, at any place, ever talked of the *novelty* of his art, without being the first importer of it. As to his citations from other later writers, who mention CAXTON as our first printer, it may be sufficient to answer in his own words, that "it is very unsafe to trust to common history, and necessary to recur to original testimonies, if we would know the state of facts with exactness." Our ingenious Author has himself detected several mistakes, which our writers have universally fallen into, and taken up from each other. If we consider that our Oxford Printer met with very small encouragement, printed probably but few books, and did not put his name to those, it is no wonder that his name and memory should be soon lost; nor will it be surprizing that CAXTON should run away with the credit of being the first printer here, who lived many years in great repute, printed a very considerable number of books, and flourished in the sunshine of the court!" N.

employed

employed at Oxford; and the obscure tradition of this fact give rise to the FICTION of the RECORD. But, however this be, it seems pretty clear that Caxton's being so well known at Cologn, and his setting up a press at home immediately after his return from that place, which could hardly be a secret to Rood, must be the ground of the compliment paid to our country, and the very thing referred to in the verses [X].

[X] The whole scope of the above colophon shews that the words of the sixth verse are not to be taken in too literal a sense: "Jensius, a Frenchman, taught the art of Printing to the Venetians: but Britain learnt it from her own ingenuity." Neither of these circumstances is strictly true. Jenson, who began printing at Venice A. D. MCCCCLXX, was preceded *two* years by Joannes de Spira; who says himself, in the edition of Cicero's Epistles ad Familiares, MCCCCLXIX, that "he first taught it to the Venetians:" (though the book above referred to, p. 23, note [N], may seem to affect his claim). Whether Caxton or Corsellis brought Printing into Britain, the art was learnt abroad. The sense then of the poet seems to be, that as Jenson, a foreigner, had brought Printing to great prefection at Venice, the English were indebted to a native for similar improvements. To denote this excellence, he calls the impression of Thomas Hunte *celatos libros*, books ENGRAVED; using that term to set his Printing in an advantageous light, who, with his partner Rood, would in time excell the Venetians. A like compliment is paid by Nicolas Gupalitinus to Clemens Patavinus, in the preface to an edition of Mesuas, *De Medicinis universalibus*, Ven. MCCCCLXXI. See MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 35, 36. B. & N.

We

We have one book more, without the name of printer or place, which, from the comparison of the types with those of Rood, is judged to be of his printing, and added to the catalogue of his works by Mr. Lewis in his Ms. Papers, viz.

"Exposicio ac moralisacio tertij capituli trenorum Jheremie prophete. Fol. MCCCCLXXXII."

And at the end of the index,

"Explicit tabula super opus trenorum compilatum per Johann. Latteburij ordinis minorum."

But the identity of the letter in different books, though a probable argument, is not always a certain one for the identity of the press.

Besides this early Printing at Oxford, *our Library* gives us proof of the use of it likewise, about the same time, in the city of London, much earlier than our writers had imagined, with the names of two of *the first printers* there, that none of them take notice of; JOHN LETTOU and WILL. DE MACHLINIA. Of the first, we have, "Jacobus de Valencia in Psalterium, &c. excus. in civitate Londoniensi, ad expensas Johannis Wilcock, per me Johannem Lettou MCCCCLXXXI. fol." Of the second; "Speculum Christiani, &c." and at the end; "Iste libellus impressus est in opulentissima Civitate Londoniarum per Willelmum Machlinia, ad instanciam necnon expensas Henrici Urankerberg mercatoris." quarto: without date, but in a very coarse and Gothic character, more rude than Caxton's: and from both these printers in partnership, we have the first edition

tion of the famous *Littleton's Tenures*; printed at London, in a small folio, without date; which his great Commentator, the Lord Chief Justice Coke, had not seen or heard of: for, in the Preface to his Institutes, he says, "That this work was not published in print either by Judge Littleton himself or Richard his son; and that the first edition, that he had seen, was printed at Roan in Normandy, ad instanciam Richardi Pynson, printer to King Henry VIII." We have this edition also in our Library, but it is undoubtedly later by thirty or forty years than the other we are speaking of; which, as far as we may collect from the time noted above, in which Joh. Lettou printed, was probably published, or at least put to the press, by the author himself, who died in 1481.

Whilst Printing was thus going forward at Westminster, Oxford, and London, there was a press also employed at St. Alban's, by the *Schoolmaster* of that place; whose name has not had the fortune to be transmitted to us, though he is mentioned as a man of merit, and friend of Caxton. He had drawn up, and printed in English, a Book of Chronicles, commonly called "Fructus Temporum, anno 1483;" which I have never been able to meet with: but in a later edition of it, after his death, there is the following colophon:

"Here endyth this present cronycle of Englond with the frute of tymes, compiled in a booke and enprynted by one sometyme Scolemayster of St. Albons,

bons, on whoos ſoule God have mercy, and newly enprynted at Weſtmeſtre by Wynkyn de Worde, MCCCCLXXXXVII.

It was the ſame ſchoolmaſter, without doubt, who printed three years before in Latin:

"Rhetorica nova Fratris Laurentij Gulielmi de Soana ordinis minorum, compilata in alma Univerſitate Cantabrigiæ ann. 1478, impreſſa apud Villam Sti Albani. MCCCCLXXX."

This was once in biſhop More's library, being deſcribed in the printed catalogue of his other rare books [Y]: but it is now loſt, or ſtolen from that noble collection; which, by an example of munificence ſcarce to be paralleled, was given to our Univerſity by his Majeſty King George the Firſt, and will remain a perpetual monument of the great mind and publick ſpirit of that Prince.

The ſame book is mentioned by Mr. Strype among thoſe given by archbiſhop Parker to Corpus-Chriſti college in Cambridge; but the words, *compilata in Univerſitate Cantabrigiæ*, have drawn this learned Antiquary into the miſtake of imagining, that it was printed alſo that year at *our* Univerſity, and of doing us the honour of remarking upon it, "So ancient was Printing in Cambridge." Life of Archbiſhop Parker, p. 519.

We have one piece however in our library from this preſs, in a ſmall folio, and at the end of it the following advertiſement:

[Y] Catal. Libror. Manuſcriptor. Angl. Oxon. p. 391.

"There in thys boke afore ar contenyt the bokys of haukyng and huntyng with other plesuris dyverse. And also of coote armuris a nobull werke. And here now endyth the boke of blasyng of armys, translatyt and complyt togedyr at Saynt Albons MCCCCLXXXVI."

After the first treatise of hawking and hunting, &c. is added, "Explicit Dam Julyans Barnes in her boke of huntyng." Though her name be subjoined to the first part only, yet the whole is constantly ascribed to her, and passes for her work. She was of a noble family, sister to Richard lord Berners of Essex, and prioress of Sopwell nunnery near St. Alban's: she lived about the year 1460, and is celebrated by Leland and other writers for her uncommon learning and accomplishments, under the name of Juliana Berners.

I shall now return to Mr. CAXTON, and state as briefly as I can the positive evidence that remains of his being the first printer of this kingdom; for what I have already alledged is chiefly negative or circumstantial. And here, as I hinted at setting out, all our writers before the Restoration, who mention the introduction of the art amongst us, give him the credit of it, without any contradiction or variation. Stowe, in his Survey of London, speaking of the 37th year of Henry VI, or 1458, says, "The noble Science of Printing was about this time found at Magunce by Joh. Guttemberg, a knight; and WILLIAM CAXTON of London, mercer, brought it into England about the

the year 1471, and first practised the same in the abbey of Westminster." Trussel gives the same account in the History of Henry VI; and Sir Richard Baker in his Chronicle: and Mr. Howell, in his Londinopolis, describes the place where the Abbot of Westminster set up the first press for Caxton's use, in the Almonry or Ambry. But above all, the famous Joh. Leland, Library-keeper to Henry VIII, who by way of honour had the title of *The Antiquary*, and lived near to Caxton's own time, expressly calls him "The first Printer of England" (De Script. Brit. p. 480), and speaks honourably of his works: and as he had spent some time in Oxford, after having first studied and taken a degree at Cambridge, he could hardly be ignorant of the Origin and History of Printing in that University [Z]. I cannot forbear

[Z] Leland calls Caxton, *The first Printer of England*; meaning, that he was the first who practised that art with *fusile Types*, and consequently first brought it to perfection; and this is not inconsistent with Corsellis's having printed earlier at Oxford with *separate cut Types in Wood*, which was the only method he had learnt at Harleim. In like manner, the epitaph on THEODORIC MARTENS, who practised this art at Alost above sixty years, and died May 28, 1534, aged more than eighty, describes HIM as the *Inventor* of Printing: "Qui artem characterizandi è Superiori Germania, Galliaque, in Inferiorem hanc Germaniam transtulit;" that is, *on metal types*, which were universally used in Germany and Gaul when Martens was a young man, and were styled, by way of eminence, *ars impressoria*, or *characterizandi*. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 97, 98. vol. II. p. 34. N.

adding, for the ſake of a name ſo celebrated, the more modern teſtimony of Mr. Henry Wharton, (Append. ad Cave, Hiſt. Liter. p. 49;) who affirms "Caxton to have been the firſt that imported the Art of Printing into this kingdom." On whoſe authority, I imagine, the no leſs celebrated M. Du Pin ſtyles him likewiſe the firſt printer of England. (Eccleſ. Hiſt. Cent. XIV. p. 71. ed. Engl.).

To the atteſtation of our hiſtorians, who are clear in favour of Caxton, and quite ſilent concerning an earlier preſs at Oxford, the works of Caxton himſelf add great confirmation: the *rudeneſs of the letter*; *irregularity of the page*; *want of ſignatures*; *initial letters*, &c. in his firſt impreſſions, give a prejudice at ſight of their being the firſt productions of the art amongſt us. But, beſides theſe circumſtances, I have taken notice of a paſſage in one of his books, (Recule, &c. in the end of the third book), that amounts in a manner to a direct teſtimony of it. "Thus end I this book, &c. and for as moche as in wrytyng of the ſame my penne is worn, myn hande wery, and myn eyen dimmed with overmoche lokyng on the whit paper—and that age crepeth on me dayly—and alſo becauſe I have promyſid to dyverce gentilmen and to my frendes to addreſſe to hem as haſtely as I might this ſayd book: Therefore I have practyſed, and lerned at my grete charge and diſpenſe to ordeyne this ſayd book in prynte after the maner and forme as ye may here ſee, and is not wreton with penne and ynke as other bokes ben to thende that every

every man may have them attones, for all the bookes of this ſtorye, named, the Recule of the hiſtoryes of Troyes, thus empryntid as ye here ſee, were begonne in oon day and alſo finiſhed in oon day, &c." Now this is the very *ſtyle and language of the firſt Printers*, as every body knows, who has been at all converſant with old books. Fauſt and Schoeffer, the inventors, ſet the example in their firſt works from Mentz; by advertiſing the publick at the end of each, "That they were not drawn or written by a pen (as all books had been before), but made by a new art and invention of printing, or ſtamping them by characters or types of metal ſet in forms." In imitation of whom, the ſucceeding printers, in moſt cities of Europe, where the art was new, generally gave the like advertiſement; as we may ſee from Venice, Rome, Naples, Verona, Baſil, Augſburg, Louvain, &c. juſt as our Caxton, in the inſtance above.

In Pliny's Natural Hiſtory, printed at Venice, we have the following verſes:

"Quem modo tam rarum cupiens vix lector haberet;
Quiq; etiam fractus pœne legendus eram:
Reſtituit Venetis me nuper Spira Johannes;
Exſcripſitq; libros ære notante meos.
Feſſa manus quondam, moneo, calamuſq; quieſcat:
Namq; labor ſtudio ceſſit & ingenio. MCCCCLXVIIII."

In a Spaniſh hiſtory of Rodericus Santius, printed at Rome:

"De mandato R. P. D. Roderici Epiſcopi Palentini Auctoris hujus libri, ego UDALRICUS GALLUS ſine calamo aut pennis eund. librum impreſſi."

At

at the end of Cicero's Philippic Orations:

"Anser Tarpeii custos Jovis, unde, quod alis
Constreperes, Gallus decidit; Ultor adest
ULDRICUS GALLUS: ne quem poscantur in usum,
Edocuit pennis nil opus esse tuis.
Imprimit ille die, quantum non scribitur anno.
Ingenio, haud noceas, omnia vincit homo."

In Eusebius's Chronicon, printed in Latin at Milan:

"Omnibus ut pateant, tabulis impressit ahenis
Utile Lavania gente Philippus opus.
Hactenus hoc toto rarum fuit orbe volumen,
Quod vix, qui ferret tædia, scriptor erat.
Nunc ope Lavaniæ numerosa volumina nostri
Ære perexiguo qualibet urbe legunt."

And as this is a strong proof of his being *our first Printer*; so it is a probable one, that this very book was *the First* of his printing. I have never seen the *Liber Festialis*, a book without date, which Mr. Palmer (Hist. of Printing, p. 340), takes for *his first*: but the reasons assigned for it seem to agree full as well to the Recule of the Histories of Troy: and, had he met with this perfect in the end of the third book, he would probably have been of another mind. Caxton had finished the translation of the two first books at Cologn in 1471: and, having then good leisure, resolved to translate the third at the same place (Recule, &c. end of the second book); in the end of which, we have the passage recited above.

above. Now, in his other books translated, as this was, from the French, he commonly marks the precise time of his entering on the translation; of his finishing it; and of his putting it afterwards into the press: which used to follow each other with little or no intermission, and were generally compleated within the compass of a few months. So that in the present case, after he had finished the translation, which must be in, or soon after, the year 1471, it is not likely that he would delay the impression longer than was necessary for the preparing of his materials; especially as he was engaged by promise to his friends, who seem to have been pressing and in haste, to deliver copies of it to them as soon as possible.

But as in the case of the *First Printer*, so in this of his *First Work*, we have a testimony also from himself in favour of this book: for I have observed that, in the recital of his works, he mentions it the first in order, before "the Book of Chesse," which seems to be a good argument of its being actually *the first*. "Whan I had—accomplished dyvers werkys and hystorys translated out of frenshe into englishe at the requeste of certayn lordes ladyes and gentylmen, as the Recuyel of the Historyes of Troye, the Book of Chesse, the Historye of Jason, the Historye of the Mirrour of the World—I have submysed myself to translate into englishe the Legende of Sayntes, called Legenda Aurea in latyn—and Wylyam Erle of Arondel desyred me—and promysed to take a resonable quantyte of them—sente to me a

worſhipful gentylman—promyſing that my ſayd lord ſhould duryng my lyf geve and graunt to me a yerely fee, that is to note, a buck in ſommer and a doo in wynter, &c." (Maittaire, Supplem. ad Tom. I. Annal. p. 440, not. 4.).

All this, added to the common marks of earlier antiquity, which are more obſervable in this than in any other of his books that I have yet ſeen, viz. *the rudeneſs of the letter*; the *incorrectneſs of the language*; and the *greater mixture of French words*, than in his later pieces; makes me conclude it to be his *firſt work*; executed when he came freſh from a long reſidence in foreign parts. Nay, there are ſome circumſtances to make us believe, that it was actually printed abroad at Cologn, where he finiſhed the tranſlation, and where he had been *practiſing and learning the Art*: for, after the account given above, of his having learnt to print, he immediately adds, "Whiche book I have preſented to my ſayd redoubtid lady Margrete, Ducheſſe of Burgoyne, &c. and ſhe hath well acceptid hit, and largely rewarded me, &c." which ſeems to imply his continuance abroad till after the impreſſion, as well as the tranſlation of the book [AA]. The conjecture is much ſtrengthened by another fact atteſted of him; That he did really print at Cologn the firſt edition of "Bartholomæus de proprietatibus rerum," in Latin:

[AA] It is not ſaid, or ſuppoſed, that Caxton came over with Corſellis, though he was an aſſiſtant with Turnour in getting him off. See above, p. 4. B.

which

which is affirmed by Wynkyn de Worde, in an Engliſh edition of the ſame book, in the following lines [BB]:

"And alſo of your charyte beare in remembraunce
The ſoule of William Caxton firſt printer of this boke,
In laten tongue at Coleyn himſelf to advaunce,
That every well diſpoſyd man may thereon loke."

I have never ſeen, or met with any one who has ſeen, this *Latin* edition of Bartholomæus by Caxton. It is certain that the ſame book was printed at Cologn by Jo. Koelholf, and the firſt that appears of his printing, in the year 1470 [CC], whilſt Caxton was at the place, and buſying himſelf in the art: and, if we ſuppoſe him to have been the encourager and promoter of the work, or to have furniſhed the expence of it, he might poſſibly on that account be conſidered at home as the author of it.

It is now time to make an end, leſt I be cenſured for ſpending too much pains on an argument ſo inconſiderable; where my only view is, to ſet right

[BB] Maittaire, Annal. Append. ad Tom. I. p. 31.

[CC] Ibid. p. 296.—This ſuppoſition is entirely overthrown by an undoubted proof of the date MCCCCLXX, in the copy Dr. MIDDLETON refers to, having been altered from MCCCCLXXXIII, by an eraſure. See Note [L], p. 21. It is however extremely probable, from the verſes of Wynkin de Worde, that the *firſt edition* of this book was printed by Caxton at Cologn, without the name of place or printer. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 59, 60. N.

ſome little points of hiſtory, that had been falſely or negligently treated by our writers, to which the courſe of my ſtudies and employment engaged me to pay ſome attention: and, above all, to do a piece of juſtice to the memory of our worthy countryman WILLIAM CAXTON; nor ſuffer him to be robbed of the glory, ſo clearly due to him, of having *firſt imported into this kingdom* an art of great uſe and benefit to mankind: a kind of merit, that, in the ſenſe of all nations, gives the beſt title to true praiſe, and the beſt claim to be commemorated with honour to poſterity: and it ought to be inſcribed on his monument, what I find declared of another printer, Bartholomæus Bottonus of Reggio; PRIMUS EGO IN PATRIA MODO CHARTAS ÆRE SIGNAVI, ET NOVUS BIBLIOPOLA FUI, &c. (Maittaire, Append. ad tom. I. p. 432. in not.)

He had been bred very reputably in the way of trade, and ſerved an apprenticeſhip to one Robert Large, a mercer; who, after having been ſheriff and lord mayor of London, died in the year 1441, and left by will, as may be ſeen in the Prerogative-office, XXIIII marks to his apprentice WILLIAM CAXTON: a conſiderable legacy in thoſe days, and an early teſtimonial of his good character and integrity.

From the time of his maſter's death, he ſpent the following thirty years beyond ſea, in the buſineſs of merchandize: where, in the year 1464, we find him employed by Edward IV, in a publick and honourable negotiation, jointly with one Richard Whitehill, eſq; to tranſact and conclude a treaty of commerce between

between the king and his brother-in-law the duke of Burgundy, to whom Flanders belonged. The commiſſion ſtyles them, "Ambaſſiatores, Procuratores, Nuncios, & Deputatos ſpeciales;" and gives to both or either of them full powers to treat, &c. [DD].

Whoever turns over his printed works, muſt contract a reſpect for him, and be convinced that he preſerved the ſame character through life, of an honeſt, modeſt man; greatly induſtrious to do good to his country, to the beſt of his abilities, by ſpreading among the people ſuch books as he thought uſeful to religion and good-manners, which were chiefly tranſlated from the French. The novelty and uſefulneſs of his art recommended him to the ſpecial notice and favour of the great; under whoſe protection, and at whoſe expence, the greateſt part of his works were publiſhed. Some of them are addreſſed to king Edward the Fourth; his brother the Duke of Clarence; and their ſiſter the Dutcheſs of Burgundy; in whoſe ſervice and pay he lived many years, before he began to print; as he oft acknowledges with great gratitude. He printed likewiſe for the uſe, and by the expreſs order, of Henry the Seventh; his ſon Prince Arthur; and many of the principal nobility and gentry of that age: all which confirms the notion of his being *the firſt Printer*; for he would hardly have been ſo much careſſed and employed, had there been an earlier and abler artiſt all the while at Ox-

[DD] Rymer, Fœd. tom. XI. p. 536. Item Maittaire, Annal. Typ. Append. ad tom. I. p. 33.

ford, who yet had no employment at all for the ſpace of eleven years.

It has been generally aſſerted and believed, that all his books were printed in the Abbey of Weſtminſter; yet we have no aſſurance of it from himſelf, nor any mention of the place before the year 1477: ſo that he had been printing ſeveral years, without telling us where. There is one miſtake, however, worth the correcting, that the writers have univerſally fallen into, and taken up from each other; That John Iſlip was the abbot who firſt encouraged the art, and entertained the artiſt in his houſe: whereas I find upon enquiry, that he was not made abbot till four years after Caxton's death; and that Thomas Milling was abbot in 1470, made biſhop of Hereford a few years after [1474], and probably held the abbey *in commendam* till the year 1485, in which John Eſtney next ſucceeded: ſo that Milling, who was reputed a great ſcholar, muſt have been the generous friend and patron of Caxton, who gave that liberal reception to an art ſo beneficial to learning [EE].

This ſhews how unſafe it is to truſt to common hiſtory, and how neceſſary it is to recur to original teſtimonies, where we would know the ſtate of facts with exactneſs. Mr. ECHARD, at the end of Edward the Fourth's reign, among the learned of that age, mentions WILLIAM CAXTON as a writer of Engliſh Hiſtory; but ſeems to doubt whether he was the ſame with the printer of that name. Had he ever

[EE] Willis's Hiſtory of Mitred Abbeys, vol. I. p. 206.

looked

looked into Caxton's books, the doubt had been cleared; or had he consulted his Chronicle of England [FF], which it is strange that an English Historian could neglect, he would have learnt at least to fix the beginning of that reign with more exactness, as it is noted above, just TWO YEARS earlier than he has placed it in his History of England [GG].

There

[FF] With deference to the opinion of CAXTON, it is placing his authority too high, when most, if not all, our English Chronicles are made to submit to his, and a new æra is prescribed to one of our kings by it. It is needless to appeal to contemporary historians, where we are capable of producing demonstration. We have already vindicated the true reading of our old Almanacks, and exterminated a false one from CAXTON's Chronicle. But the Doctor raises a triumph on his great discovery; and poor Echard is singled out to be lashed, for not reading this Chronicle, or not making the same use of it as the Doctor does. See above, Note [D], p. 8. B. & N.

[GG] *Just* ONE *year*, Dr. MIDDLETON should have said; ECHARD fixing it very right, 4 March, 1461, *according to the common computation in those days*, (i. e. 1460-1); the Doctor 1459, *according to our computation*, (i. e. 1459-60). But this gentleman seems resolved to be at variance with that Historian as far as possible. He gives us his doubts; but so much the worst side of them, that it is but just to let the Historian speak for himself: "In this reign flourished JOHN HARDING and WILLIAM CAXTON, both writers of the English History. And that which now began to give encouragement to Learning, was the famous Art of Printing, which was first found out in Germany by JOHN GUTTENBERGHEN about 1440, or somewhat later, and was brought into

There is no clear account left of Caxton's age: but he was certainly very old, and probably above fourſcore, at the time of his death. In the year 1471 he complained, as we have ſeen, of the infirmities of age creeping upon him, and feebling his body; yet he lived twenty-three years after, and purſued his buſineſs, with extraordinary diligence, in the abbey of Weſtminſter, till the year 1494 [HH], in which he died; not in the year following, as all, who write of him, affirm. This appears from ſome verſes at the end of a book, called, "Hilton's Scale of Perfection," printed in the ſame year:

"Infynite laud with thankynges many folde
I yelde to God me ſocouryng with his grace
This boke to finyſhe which that ye beholde
Scale of Perfeccion calde in every place
Whereof th'auctor Walter Hilton was
And Wynkyn de Worde this hath ſett in print
In William Caxſtons hows ſo fyll the caſe,
God reſt his ſoule. In joy ther mot it ſtynt.
Impreſſus anno ſalutis MCCCCLXXXXiiii."

Though he had printed for the uſe of Edward IV, and Henry VII; yet I find no ground for the notion

into England by WILLIAM CAXTON, a mercer of LONDON, and PROBABLY the ſame with the Hiſtorian, who firſt practiſed the ſame in the Abbey of Weſtminſter 1461, and the 11th of this reign." The Hiſtorian writes ſo agreeably to the Doctor's hypotheſis, that one would think he need not be ſo much aſhamed of his company. B. & N.

[HH] No longer than the year 1491, as Mr. Ames has ſince proved from his epitaph, and the edition of Catal. Biblioth. Harl. vol. III. p. 127. B.

which

which Palmer takes up, that the firſt printers, and particularly CAXTON, were ſworn ſervants and printers to the crown: for Caxton, as far as I have obſerved, gives not the leaſt hint of any ſuch character or title; though it ſeems to have been inſtituted not long after his death: for of his two principal workmen, Richard Pynſon and Wynkin de Worde, the one was made Printer to the King; the other, to the King's mother the Lady Margaret. Pynſon gives himſelf the firſt title, in "The Imitation of the Life of Chriſt," printed by him at the commandment of the Lady Margaret, who had tranſlated the fourth book of it from the French, in the year 1504: and Wynkin de Worde aſſumes the ſecond, in "The ſeven Penitential Pſalms," expounded by biſhop Fiſher, and printed in the year 1509.

But there is the title of a book given by Palmer, that ſeems to contradict what is here ſaid of Pynſon: viz. "Pſalterium ex mandato victorioſiſſimi Angliæ Regis Henrici Septimi, per Gulielmum Fanque, Impreſſorem Regium, anno MDIIII;" which, being the only work that has ever been found of this printer, makes it probable, that he died in the very year of its impreſſion, and was ſucceeded immediately by Richard Pynſon: whoſe uſe of the ſame title ſo ſoon after ſhews the writers to be miſtaken in this, and ſeveral other particulars relating to his hiſtory, as well as that of Wynkin de Worde, which it is not my preſent buſineſs to explain.

ESSAY II.

Mr. MEERMAN's ACCOUNT OF The ORIGIN of PRINTING. WITH REMARKS.

IT may ſeem ſomewhat ſtrange that the original of Printing has hitherto eluded all the reſearches of the Learned; and that this Art, which has given light to all others, ſhould itſelf remain in obſcurity. And yet the wonder will ceaſe, if we conſider that it was invented as a more expeditious method of multiplying books than by writing, which it was at firſt deſigned to counterfeit; and conſequently was concealed for private intereſt, rather than revealed to the honour of the proprietor and the advantage of the publick.

As Mr. MEERMAN has endeavoured to reconcile ſome difficulties on this head in his valuable *Origines Typographicæ*; we ſhall briefly lay them before the Engliſh Reader, by which he will ſee the many miſtakes of every one of our lateſt writers on the ſubject; and that the difficulties have ariſen, not ſo much from the want of hiſtorical evidences, as from not attending to the true ſenſe of them; from overlooking the art

in that imperfect state, when it existed but as an embryo not born into day-light.

The three cities, Mr. MEERMAN observes, which have the fairest claim to this honour, are Harleim, Mentz, and Strasburgh: to each it is to be ascribed in a qualified sense; the improvements the one made upon the other entitling them all, in some sort, to the merit of the invention.

The first testimony of the inventor is that recorded by Hadrian Junius, in his Batavia, p. 253, ed. Lugd. Bat. 1588; which, though it hath been rejected by many, is of undoubted authority. Junius had the relation from two reputable men; Nicolaus Galius [A], who was his schoolmaster; and Quirinius Talesius, his intimate and correspondent. He ascribes it to Laurentius the son of John (Ædituus, or Custos, of the cathedral at Harleim, at that time a respectable office), upon the testimony of Cornelius, sometime a servant to Laurentius, and afterwards bookbinder

[A] Galius seems to be the same who is called *Claes Lottynsz. Gael*, Scabinus Harlemi, as it is in the Fasti of that city, in the years 1531, 1533, and 1535. Quirinius in the same Fasti is called *Mr. Quiryn Dirkszoon*. He was many years amanuensis to the great ERASMUS, as appears from his Epistle, 23 July, 1529, tom. III. Oper. p. 1222. He was afterwards Scabinus in 1537 & seq.; and Consul in 1552 & seq. But in the troubles of Holland he was cruelly killed by the Spanish soldiers, May 23, 1573. There are some Letters of HADRIAN JUNIUS to this TALESIUS, in the *Epistolæ Junianæ*, p. 198. N.

to the cathedral, an office which had before been performed by Franciscan fryars. His narrative was thus: "That, walking in a wood near the city (as the "citizens of opulence use to do), he began at first to "cut some letters upon the rind of a beach-tree; "which, for fancy's sake, being impressed on paper, "he printed one or two lines, as a specimen for his "grandchildren (the sons of his daughter) to follow. This having happily succeeded, he meditated greater things (as he was a man of ingenuity "and judgement); and first of all, with his son-in-law "THOMAS PETER (who, by the way, left three sons, "who all attained the consular dignity), invented a "more glutinous writing-ink, because he found the "common ink sunk and spread; and then formed "whole pages of wood, with letters cut upon them; "of which sort I have seen some essays, in an anonymous work, printed only on one side, intituled, "*Speculum nostræ salutis*; in which it is remarkable, "that in the infancy of Printing (as nothing is complete at its first invention) the back sides of the pages "were pasted together, that they might not by their "nakedness betray their deformity. These beachen "letters he afterwards changed for leaden ones, and "these again for a mixture of tin and lead [*stanneas*], "as a less flexible and more solid and durable substance. Of the remains of which types, when they "were turned to waste metal, those old wine-pots "were cast, that are still preserved in the family-"house, which looks into the market-place, inhabited

"afterwards

"afterwards by his great grandson GERARD THOMAS, "a gentleman of reputation; whom I mention for the "honour of the family, and who died old a few years "since. A new invention never fails to engage curio- "sity. And when a commodity never before seen ex- "cited purchasers, to the advantage of the inventor; "the admiration of the art increased, dependents were "enlarged, and workmen multiplied, the first ca- "lamitous incident! Among these was one JOHN, "whether, as we suspect, he had ominously the name "of FAUSTUS [B], unfaithful and unlucky to his "master, or whether it was really a person of that "name, I shall not much inquire; being unwilling to "molest

[B] Etymology, as it leads to the true meaning of words, is a kind of historical knowledge, which renders the study of Grammar more pleasing. To produce the various lights which it affords would be endless; but we may be indulged in mentioning one instance, which is immediately connected both with our profession and the person here mentioned. JOHN FAUST, or FUST, is by many supposed to have derived his name from *Faustus*, happy; and Dr. *Faustus* seems to carry an air of grandeur in the appellation: but very erroneously. *John Faust*, or *Fust*, is no more than *John Hand*, whence our name *Fist*. This is of small moment in itself, if an eminent German Critic (ERASMUS SCHMIDIUS) had not refined too much upon it, and led himself into a mistake by his too great knowledge. The famous editions of Tully's Offices by JOHN FUST (for there are certainly two, one in 1465, the other in 1466) have the following colophons. The first of them,

" moleſt the ſilent ſhades, who ſuffer from a conſcious-
" neſs of their paſt actions in this life. This man,
" bound

Preſens Marci tulij clariſſimũ opus. Johannes fuſt, Mogũtinus civis. nõ atramẽto. plumali cãna neq; aerea. Sed arte quadam perpulcra. *Petri manu pueri mei* feliciter effeci. finitum Anno M. cccc. lxv.

The ſecond is worded with more exactneſs, and ſtands thus:

Preſens Marci tulij clariſſimũ opus. Johannes fuſt Mogũtinus civis. nõ attramẽto. plumali cãna neq; aerea. Sed arte quadam perpulcra. *manu Petri de gernſhem pueri mei* feliciter effeci finitum. Anno M. cccc.lxvi. *quarta die menſis februarij, &c.*

Now Schmidius, in Nov. Teſt. Norimbergæ, 1658, p. 5, tells us, he was poſſeſſed of a copy of this book, with the firſt of theſe colophons; and had heard of, but never ſeen, the other. This learned Critic, full of the meaning of the name *Fuſt*, ſays: " Moneo non rectè ſcribi *manu Petri*, &c. quaſi τὸ *manu* eſſet ablativus inſtrumenti; quum ab autore, licet σολοίκως, uſurpetur in genitivo, *arte Petri Manu*, & ſit proprium, **Peter Fuſt, oder Fauſt**, non appellativum." The Latin indeed, if ſo read, is not diſagreeable to the rudeneſs of the age, when that language, though much diffuſed, was yet read and written with a very low degree of accuracy. But the misfortune is, Schmidius's reading is inconſiſtent with hiſtory: for it does not appear that JOHN FUST had any ſon or ſervant named PETER, except PETER SCHOEFFER de *Gernſheim*, to whom, for being an uſeful aſſiſtant to him in his art, he gave his daughter CHRISTIAN FUST in marriage;

" bound by oath to keep the ſecret of Printing, when " he thought he had learnt the art of joining the " letters,

riage; and it is not clear that it was a cuſtom in Germany for the huſband to change his name for the wife's.—There can be very little doubt, therefore, of there having been *two editions*, unleſs the variation is accounted-for by ſuppoſing that the colophon in Schmidius's copy was printed off before it was fully corrected; which might poſſibly be the caſe, becauſe the month and day ſeem to have been omitted. But, after all, if Schmidius had *ſeen* the colophon of 1466, he muſt have given up his interpretation of *manu*.—We leave this, however, as a curioſity to be ſought after; and as highly to be prized, when poſſeſſed, as Duke Lauderdale's Bible, with the forgery in it of, *Paul, a* KNAVE *of Jeſus Chriſt* *.

Mr. Maittaire (in his Annales Typographici, 1719, vol. I. p. 60.) tells us, " he has COMPARED the editions of 1465 and 1466; and finds them, except the variation of the colophon, EXACTLY the ſame." [In his Supplementary Volume, 1733, p. 275. this gentleman tells us, he ſaw in the Library of Sir THOMAS COOKE, K. B. an edition of 1465; in which were inſerted ſome Mſ. remarks; particularly that H. Salmuth (in his notes on Pancirolus) and Peter Ramus mention copies of 1466. " Ergo (ſays the anonymous writer) accuratius diſpiciendum, num planè diverſæ ſint editiones." In a note on this paſſage, Mr. MAITTAIRE again repeats, that he has compared a copy of 1465 with one of 1466; and is ſtill of opinion they are but *one edition*.]—Mr. Palmer, either not knowing this circumſtance, or not attending to it, ſays (p. 81), " It is very probable theſe editions may be *the ſame*, " the laſt ſheet only reprinted; *which may be eaſily known*

* See an account of this book in the Notes of Forteſcue Aland, Eſq; on Forteſcue on Abſolute and Limited Monarchy, p. 42.

" *by*

"letters, the method of casting the types, and other "things of that nature, taking the most convenient time "that

"*by comparing them together*; and it were to be wished, that "some of the curioso's of Oxford would take that trouble, "since they are both there, as appears from Ant. Wood's "list."—The reverend Dr. Taylor, chancellor of Lincoln, afterwards examined both editions, and favoured us with the following remark: "I HAVE COMPARED THEM too, and "EXACTLY; and find them VERY DIFFERENT: every "page indeed beginning and ending alike, but not every "line: the shape also of several letters being very different, "particularly *m*, as thus, ꝏ. M. J. T."

That the *s*, *ſ*, and *d*, are likewise differently formed in these copies, see Catal. Bibl. Harl. vol. IV. A. D. 1744, p. 520.

A very full account of these editions is given in the *Bibliographie Instructive, par Guillaume François De Bure le Jeune*, 1765, *Belles Lettres*, tom. I. N° 2425, p. 151. The first of them has so many variations as to induce that writer to think there were *three* or *four* editions in 1465. In two copies which he compared,

	The one has,		The other,
In the first line of the Title,	*Arpinatis*	——	*Arpmatis*
In the third line;	*incipit*	——	*mcipit*
In the fourth line,	Prefatio	——	Prefacio
In the same page, line 20,	*nichil*	——	*nihil*
In the Latin verses at the end of Book III.	cupiens	——	cupis
At the end of the Paradoxes, *sunt*; and the following line *in red*, Marci Tulii Ciceronis Paradoxa finit.			sit, without the *red* line.
In the Versus XII Sapientum,	sapientu	——	sapientū
Les *Ecussons* de Schoyffer, at the end of the Ode of Horace, appear (in red.)			(wanting.)

The titles of *Three Precepts of Friendship* are transposed in the first edition, and right in the second; and many other variations, too minute to mention.

Mr.

"that was possible, on Christmas-eve, when every one "was customarily employed in lustral sacrifices, seizes "the collection of types, and all the implements his "master had got together, and, with one accomplice, "marches off to Amsterdam, thence to Cologn, and "at last settled at Mentz, as at an asylum of security, "where he might go to work with the tools he had "stolen. It is certain that in a year's time, viz. in "1442, the *Doctrinale* of Alexander Gallus, which "was a Grammar much used at that time, together "with the *Tracts* of Peter of Spain, came forth there, "from the same types as Laurentius had made use of "at Harlem."

Thus far the narrative of Junius, which he had frequently heard from Nicolaus Galius; to whom it was related by Cornelius himself, who lived to a great age, and used to burst into tears upon reflecting on the loss his master had sustained, not only in his substance, but in his honour, by the roguery of this servant, his former associate and bedfellow. Cornelius, as appears by the

Mr. De Bure adds, that in the copy of 1465, which Clement examined, the *Four Lines of Title* are wanting; and therefore imagines this may be a *third* edition: but they may have been accidentally omitted, as those lines are *in red* in the other copies; and therefore this is most probably *not* a different edition. He supposes also a *fourth* edition, as he has seen a copy *on vellum*, in which the word *incipit* is omitted in the title of the Paradoxes. Its being on vellum, however, is no criterion of a *new* edition.

Dr. Askew had a fine copy of the edition of 1465, which Dr. Hunter bought for thirty pounds. A copy on vellum of that of 1466 is in the British Museum. B. & N.

registers

registers of Harleim cathedral, died either in 1515 or the beginning of the following year; so that he might very well give this information to Nicolaus Galius, who was school-master to Hadrian Junius.

Though this circumstance is probable as to the main fact, yet we must set aside the evidence of it in some particulars. The first obvious difficulty is noticed by Scriverius; "that the types are said to be made of the *rind* of beach, which could not be strong enough to bear the impression of the press." This is removed, if, instead of the *bark*, we substitute a *bough* of the beach. The idea of the *bark*, when Junius wrote this, was perhaps strong in his mind, from what Virgil tells us (Ecl. v. 13.) of its being usual to cut words on the *bark* of a beach; and thence he was easily led to make a wrong application of it here.

2. The letters were at first *wooden*, and are said to be afterwards exchanged for *metal* types; from which the wine-pots were formed, remaining in the time of Junius. According to tradition, Printing was carried on in the same house long after the time of Laurentius: those pots might therefore be formed from the waste metal of the printing-house, after the use of *fusile types* became universal. But Laurentius seems to have carried the art no farther than *separate wooden types*. What is a remarkable confirmation of this, HENRY SPIECHEL, who wrote, in the sixteenth century, a Dutch poem intituled *Hertspiegel*, expresses himself thus: "Thou first, Laurentius, to supply the de-
"fect of wooden tablets, adaptedst *wooden types*, and

 "afterwards

"afterwards didst connect them with a thread, to imi-
"tate writing. A treacherous servant surreptitiously
"obtained the honour of the discovery. But Truth
"itself, though destitute of common and wide-spread
"fame; Truth, I say, still remains." No mention in the Poem of *metal types*; a circumstance which, had he been robbed of such, as well as of *wooden* ones, would scarcely have been passed over in silence.

When LAURENTIUS first devised his rough specimen of the art, can only be guessed at. He died in 1440, after having published the *Speculum Belgicum* and two editions of *Donatus*, all with different *wooden types*; which it is probable (considering the difficulties he had to encounter, and the many artists whom he must necessarily have had occasion to consult) cost him some years to execute; so that the first essay might be about 1430, which nearly agrees with PETRUS SCRIVERIUS, who says, the invention was about ten or twelve years before 1440 [C].

3. What

[C] Scriverius's account is somewhat different from that of Junius. He tells us, "that Laurentius, walking in the "wood, picked up a small bough of a beech, or rather of "an oak tree, blown off by the wind; and, after amusing "himself with cutting some letters on it, wrapped it up "in paper, and afterwards laid himself down to sleep. When "he awaked, he perceived that the paper, by a shower of rain "or some accident, having got moist, had received an impres-"sion from these letters; which induced him to pursue the "accidental discovery." Scriverius, however, proceeds, according to Mr. Meerman, on a wrong hypothesis; as he

3. What was the ſpecimen which he firſt diverted himſelf with in cutting, at the diſtance of three centuries, one would think impoſſible to be diſcovered. And yet JOH. ENSCHEDIUS, a printer, thinks he was ſo happy as to find it, being an old parchment *Horarium*, printed on both ſides, in eight pages, containing the Letters of the Alphabet, the Lord's Prayer, the Apoſtles Creed, and three ſhort prayers. And Mr. MEERMAN having ſhewn this to proper artiſts, who were judges of theſe matters, they gave it as their opinion that it agreed exactly with the deſcription of Junius. It is conformable to the firſt edition of the Dutch *Speculum Salvationis* and the fragments of both *Donatus's* of Holland, both which are the works of the ſame Laurentius, and were preceded by this. In theſe types, which are certainly moveable, cut, and uneven, there is a rudeneſs, which Mr. MEERMAN has not obſerved in any other inſtance. There are no numbers to the pages, no ſignatures, no *direction-words* [D], no

takes it for granted, that the firſt eſſays were on *wooden blocks*, and not on *ſeparate* wooden types.—Junius's account is from the ſervants of Laurentius; Scriverius's is grounded on imagination, and on an error of Scaliger. The former is clear; the latter, when the circumſtance of *going to ſleep* is conſidered, ſeems to border on the marvellous. N.

[D] It is a ridiculous conceit of ſome, that theſe were called *cuſtodes* from Laurentius's name *Coſter*; whereas they undoubtedly received their name from their office, as being *keepers* to the pages, that they might follow in order; and were *never uſed* by Laurentius or his family. See MEERMAN,

no divisions at the end of the lines; on the contrary, a syllable divided in the middle is seen, thus, *Spiritū* in p. 8. l. 2, 3. There are neither distinctions nor points, which are seen in the other works of Laurentius; and the letter *í* is not marked with an accent, but with a dot at the top. The lines throughout are uneven. The shape of the pages not always the same, not (as they should be) rectangular, but sometimes rhomb-like, sometimes an *isoscele trapezium*; and the performance seems to be left as a specimen both of his piety and of his ingenuity in this essay of a new-invented art. Mr. MEERMAN has given an exact engraving of this singular curiosity.

There are FOUR other credible testimonies, who lived before Junius, that confirm the relation [E] of

MAN, vol. I. p. 77. For the introduction of *folios* and *signatures*, see note [Q], p. 27, 28. To which we may add, that Mr. MEERMAN thinks the first instance of either *folios* or *running-titles* was in the "Sermones LEON. de UTINO, "Paris, 1477;" though the use of *folios* is so obvious, that they are most probably to be found in very old MSS. N.

[E] Coeval almost with CORNELIUS was ULRIC ZELL, a native of Hanover, the first who practised Printing at Cologn, who attained the rudiments of the art by officiating as Corrector of the Press under Fust or Gutenberg, as appears by the *Chronicon* of Cologn, a work written under his own inspection. ZELL being a German, and professedly an advocate for the cause of Mentz, his testimony in favour of Harleim (where he allows the foundation of the art was laid) will be acknowledged unexceptionable. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 60. B. & N.

Cornelius, and yet seem to derive their authority from a different channel; and who all mention the theft of Laurentius's servant, and his setting-up at Mentz (see MEERMAN's *Documenta*, LXXXI—LXXXIV); viz.

1. "Zurenus, in JOANNIS VAN ZUYREN reliquiæ, "ex opusculo deperdito, cui tit. Zurenus junior, sive "de prima, et inaudita hactenus vulgo, et veriore "tamen artis typographicæ inventione dialogus, nunc "primum conscriptus, autore Joan. Zureno, Harlemeo, "ad amplissimum virum N. N. asservatæ—a Petr. "Scriverio in Laurea Laurentiana, c. II."

2. "THEODORUS VOLCKARDI COORNHERTIUS in "dedicatione præmissa versioni Belgicæ Officiorum "Ciceronis, edit. Harlem. 1561, atque inscripta Con-"sulibus, Scabinis, et Senatoribus ejusdem urbis."

3. "HENRICUS PANTALEON, Lib. de viris illustri-"bus Germaniæ, part. II. p. 397, seq. ed. Basil. 1565."

4. "LUDOVICUS GUICCIARDINUS, Descrizzione di "tutti i Paesi Bassi, edita Antwerpiæ, typis Gul. Sylvii, "1567, p. 180, in descriptione urbis Harlemi."

But PANTALEON, it should be observed, is mistaken when he ascribes to JOHN FUST the invention of Printing, and more so when he says that he took in John Schœffer, instead of Peter, partner: for John, the son of Peter, and grandson of Faustus by his daughter, was certainly not born in 1440, since he was famous in 1548. (See MARCHAND, Hist. de l'Imprimerie, p. 50.). Besides, this writer asserts that Nic. Jenson followed the art in France; who, though he was born

born in that kingdom, yet practised Printing no-where but at Venice. He mentions likewise two remarkable circumstances; one, of the manner of hiding the types when they had stolen them, "eos literas "*in sacculis clausis* secum in officinas tulisse, atque "abeuntes abstulisse;" the other, of the honour paid to the first artists [F]. The greatest part of what he has written is borrowed from WIMPHELINGIUS, Epit. Rer. German.

But, whatever else may appear doubtful in the narrative of Junius, it is very clear that the first essays of the art are to be attributed to LAURENTIUS [G], who used only *separate wooden types*. He died

[F] Mr. MEERMAN observes, that the following of other manual professions was accounted a derogation to nobility; but that this Art conferred honour on its professors. Hence it was very early practised by many who were of noble families, and even by eminent Ecclesiastics. JOHN GUTENBERG was, in 1465, received *inter Aulicos* by the Elector ADOLPHUS: and the Emperor FREDERICK III. permitted Printers to wear gold and silver; and both *Typographi* and *Typothetæ* were honoured by him with the privilege of wearing coat-armour; "Typothetis scil. aquilæ, "typographis autem gryphi, pede altero pilam tinctoriam, "unguibus tenentis, scutum donavit, cum aperta galea, et "superimposita ei corona." MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 47, 48, 207. And see hereafter, p. 99.

[G] It may not be improper here to give an abridgement of Mr. MEERMAN's account of LAURENTIUS and his family:—He was born at Harleim about 1379, and executed several

died in 1440; and Mr. MEERMAN is of opinion (on the authority of GUICCIARDINI) that the types were stolen very soon after his death.

Most

several departments of magistracy in that city.—Those writers are mistaken, who assign to him the surname of COSTER, or assert that the office of Ædituus was hereditary in his family. In a diploma of ALBERT of Bavaria, in 1380, in which, among other citizens of Harleim, our Laurentius's *father* is mentioned by the name of "JOANNES "LAURENTII filius;" BEROLDUS is called Ædituus, who was surely of another family; and in 1396 and 1398 HENRICUS à LUNEN enjoyed that office; after whose resignation, Count ALBERT conferring on the citizens the privilege of *electing* their Ædituus, they, probably soon after, fixed on LAURENTIUS; who was afterwards called COSTER, from his office, and not from his family-name, as he was descended from an illegitimate branch of the *Gens* BREDERODIA. His office was very lucrative; and that he was a man of great property, the elegance of his house may testify. That he was the *inventor* of Printing, is plain from the narrative of Junius. His first work was the *Horarium* abovementioned, p. 66; the next the *Speculum Salutis*, in which he introduced *pictures* on *wooden blocks*; then *Donatus*, the larger size; and afterwards the same work in a less size. All these were printed on *separate moveable wooden types*, fastened together by threads. If it be thought improbable that so ingenious a man should have proceeded no farther than the invention of *wooden types*; it may be answered, that he printed for profit, not for fame; and *wooden* types were not only *at that time* made sooner and cheaper than *metal* could be, but were sufficiently durable for the small impressions of each book he must necessarily

have

Moſt writers agree that there was a robbery by ſome one; though they differ in the particulars, and

have printed.—His preſs was nearly ſhaped like the common wine-preſſes.—He printed ſome copies of *all* his books both on paper and vellum.—It has been very erroneouſly ſuppoſed that he quitted the profeſſion, and died broken-hearted: but it is certain that he did not live to ſee the art brought to perfection.—He died in 1440, aged 70; and was ſucceeded either by his ſon-in-law THOMAS PETER, who married his only daughter LUCIA; or by their immediate deſcendants, PETER, ANDREW, and THOMAS; who were old enough (even if their father was dead, as it is likely he was) to conduct the buſineſs, the eldeſt being at leaſt 22 or 23. The loſs they had ſuſtained by the robbery would be repaired without much difficulty or expence; and they ſtill had the aſſiſtance of CORNELIUS, and other ſervants of their grandfather.—What books they printed, it is not eaſy to determine; they having, after the example of LAURENTIUS (more anxious for profit than for fame), neither added to their books their names, the place where they were printed, or the date of the year.—Their firſt eſſays were new editions of *Donatus* and the *Speculum*. They afterwards re-printed the latter, with a Latin tranſlation; in which they uſed their grandfather's wooden pictures; and printed the book partly on *wooden blocks*, partly on *wooden ſeparate types*, as Mr. MEERMAN clearly proves, vol. I. p. 135; who has given an exact engraving of *each ſort*, taken from different parts of the ſame book, which was publiſhed between the years 1442 and 1450. Nor did they ſtop here; but continued to print ſeveral editions of the *Speculum*, both in Latin and in Dutch. Four editions of this book are yet to

and even in the name of the person who is said to have committed it. Those who deny the whole story ground their opinion, 1. on the improbability of such a fact being done on so public a night, when the whole city must necessarily have been awake; 2. on the great difficulty there must have been in conveying a large quantity of materials through the gates of

to be seen. There are many other books in being, certainly printed in Holland, which may with probability be assigned to this family. Of the following ones in particular, there can be no doubt: "Historiæ ALEXANDRI "Magni;" "FLAVII VEDATII [for VEGETII] RENATI "Epitome de Re Militari;" and "Opera varia à THOMAS "KEMPIS." Of each of these Mr. MEERMAN has given an engraved specimen. They were all printed with *separate wooden types*; and, by their great neatness, are a proof that the descendants of LAURENTIUS were industrious in improving his invention. And hence an additional argument may be brought in favour of CORSELLIS, whose impressions were likewise on *separate wooden types*, are remarkable for their neatness, and much resembling those of Harleim, whence he came to Oxford about 1459. See above, p. 7, 8.— KEMPIS was printed at Harleim in 1472, and was the last known work of LAURENTIUS's descendants, who soon after disposed of all their materials, and probably quitted the employment; as the use of *fusile types* was about that time universally diffused through Holland by the settling of MARTENS at Alost, where he pursued the art with reputation for upwards of sixty years. PETER and ANDREW, the two eldest grandsons of LAURENTIUS, perished in the civil war of 1492. See MEERMAN's *Index primus*. B. & N.

Harleim,

Harleim, which no one was permitted to pass at night unexamined, or through the several other towns in the way to Mentz; and, 3. on his having been permitted to exercise the art after his arrival in that city, without being molested by any judicial complaint from those whom he had robbed.

To this it may be answered, that JUNIUS wrote in a very figurative manner; and, to express his abhorrence of the crime in the strongest light, accused the robber of having stolen "the collection of types, and "ALL the instruments his master had got together." But surely much less would effectually have answered the purpose of this unfaithful servant. Skilled as he must have been in every department of the business, it could be no difficulty for him to get proper workmen, in any country, who could (by his instructions) supply him with a press, and every thing else that was bulky. All that he really wanted was, *a small quantity of wooden types*, as a pattern to cut others from. These he might pack up in a little parcel, either late at night, or early in the morning; which it would be an easy matter to conceal till the city gates were opened. And indeed no time could be more suitable to such a purpose than that which is assigned to it; since, no business being performed either on that or the following day, he would be far out of their reach when the loss should be discovered; and it is highly probable that (CORNELIUS and the other servants of the family being employed in their religious duties) he had an oppor-

tunity of being some hours alone in the house, and of plundering unmolested whatever he had occasion for. Perhaps he even obtained permission from the family of his deceased master to take a journey to Amsterdam or Mentz, for which some plausible pretence might readily be formed. However this was, it would be easy to prevent the discovery of his fraud till he should be safe out of the territories of Holland. It was his business therefore to take the shortest route (through Amsterdam and Cologn) to Mentz, his native city. Here he fixed his residence, and had little to apprehend from the tribunal of Harleim, whose sentence (if any suit was ever entered against him) could extend no farther than to banish him from a country which he never more intended to re-visit.

Having shewn that a theft was actually committed, it will be necessary to inquire who was the guilty person. It is clear from all accounts that his name was JOHN [H]. ZURENUS expressly calls him *a foreigner*; and there is little doubt of his being a native of Mentz: why else should he have chosen to settle in that city, at a distance from his family

[H] It is somewhat singular, that many of the earliest Printers were thus named; as, GEINSFLEICH senior and junior, FUST, MEIDENBACHIUS, and PETERSHEMIUS; a circumstance which induced the Leipsic Printers to consecrate St. JOHN the Baptist's anniversary to festivity, as is observed by JO. STORIUS, in a Dissertation preserved by WOLFIUS, Monum. Typogr. tom. II. p. 475, *in not.* N.

and

and friends, whose assistance he would need in so new and arduous an undertaking? What his surname was, is an interesting inquiry. JUNIUS, after some hesitation, ascribes it to JOHN FUST; but with injustice: for he was a wealthy man, who assisted the first printers at Mentz with money; and though he afterwards was proprietor of a printing-office, yet he never, as far as appears, performed any part of the business with his own hands; and consequently he could never have been a servant to LAURENTIUS. Nor is the conjecture of SCRIVERIUS better founded, which fixes it upon JOHN GUTENBERG, who (as appears by authentic testimonies) resided at Strasburg from 1436 to 1444, and during all that period employed much fruitless labour and expence in endeavouring to attain this art. Mr. MEERMAN once thought, "it "might possibly be either JOHN MEIDENBACHIUS "(who, we are told by SEB. MUNSTER and the au- "thor of *Chronographia Moguntinensis*, was an as- "sistant to the first Mentz printers); or JOHN PETER- "SHEIMIUS (who was sometime a servant to FUST "and SCHOEFFER, and set up a printing-house at "Francfort 1459); or, lastly, some other person, "who, being unable through poverty to carry on "the business, discovered it to GEINSFLEICH at "Mentz." But more authentic intelligence afterwards convinced him there were two persons of this name, who appear to have been brothers, and that the junior was distinguished by the additional appellation of GUTENBERG. These were both printers;

and their history shall be given in as short a compass as possible [I].

All things being fully considered, it appears that JOHN GEINSFLEICH senior was the dishonest servant, who was born at Mentz, and who, in the papers published by KOHLERUS, we find there in the year 1441, and not before: for though he was of a good family, yet was he poor, and seems to have been obliged, as well as his brother, to have sought his livelihood in a foreign country; and perhaps was

[I] There were two JOHN GEINSFLEICHES of Mentz, the senior called GEINSFLEICH κατ' ἐξοχὴν; the other distinguished by the name of GUTENBERG. They were both poor; though of a family distinguished by knighthood. They were both married men, and were most probably brothers, as it was not uncommon in that age for two brothers to have the same Christian name. These both appear in a disreputable light. The eldest robbed his master, with many aggravating circumstances. The youngest was remarkably contentious; and, after entering into a contract of marriage with ANNA, a noble girl of *The Iron Gate*, refused to marry her till compelled by a judicial decree; and afterwards cared not what became of the lady, but left her behind at Strasburgh when he removed to Mentz. He had not only frequent quarrels with his wife; but with ANDREW DRIZEHEN, ANDREW HEILMANN, and JOHN RIFF, all of whom were associated with him at Strasburg in his different employments of making of looking-glasses, polishing of precious stones, and endeavouring to attain the art of Printing: and with these he involved himself in three law-suits. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 163, &c. N.

content

content to be under LAURENTIUS, that, when he had learnt the art, he might follow it in his own. But, to leave conjecture, we may produce some certain testimonies.

1. It is what JUNIUS himself says, that the person who stole the types did it with a view to set up elsewhere; nor is it likely that he would either make no use of an art he had seen so profitable to LAURENTIUS, or that he would teach it to another, and submit to be again a servant.

2. The Lambeth Record (which is printed above, p. 3, from Mr. ATKYNS) tells us, that "Mentz gained "the art by the brother of one of the workmen of "Harleim, who learnt it at home of his brother, "who after set up for himself at Mentz."—By the strictest examination of the best authorities, it is plain that by these *two brothers* the two GRINSFLEICHES must be meant. But as the younger (who was called GUTENBERG) was never a servant to LAURENTIUS, it must be the senior who carried off the types, and instructed his brother in the art; who first applied himself to the business at Strasburg; and afterwards joined his elder brother, who had in the mean time settled at Mentz.

What is still stronger, two Chronologers of Strasburgh, the one named DAN. SPEKLINUS, the other anonymous (in MEERMAN'S *Documenta*, Nº LXXXV, LXXXVI), tell us expressly, that JOHN GRINSFLEICH (viz. the senior, whom they distinguish from GUTENBERG), having learnt the art by being servant to its

first

first inventor, carried it by theft into Mentz, his native country. They are right in the fact, though mistaken in the application of it; for they make *Strasburg* the place of the invention, and MENTELIUS the inventor, from whom the types were stolen: but this is plainly an error; for GEINSFLEICH lived at Mentz in 1441, as appears from undoubted testimonies; and could not be a servant to MENTELIUS, to whom the beforementioned writers ascribe the invention in 1440, though more antient ones do not attempt to prove that he began to print before 1444 or 1447. Nor will the narrative agree better with GUTENBERG, who was an earlier printer than MENTELIUS; since, among the evidences produced by him in his law-suit, 1439, no GEINSFLEICH senior appears, nor any other servant but LAURENTIUS BEILDEK. The narration therefore of the theft of GEINSFLEICH, being spread by various reports through the world, and subsisting in the time of these Chronologers, was applied by them (to serve the cause they wrote for) to Strasburg; but serves to confirm the truth, since no writer derives the printing spoils from any other country than Holland or Alsatia. The Chronologers have likewise, instead of FUST, called GUTENBERG the wealthy man; who, from all circumstances, appears to have been poor. They also call SCHOEFFER the son-in-law of MENTELIUS; when it is clear that he married the daughter of FUST.

Printing being introduced from Harleim into Mentz, GEINSFLEICH senior set with all diligence to carry it

it on; and published in 1442 ALEXANDRI GALLI *Doctrinale* [K], and PETRI HISPANI *Tractatus*; two works, which, being small, best suited his circumstances, and for which, being much used in the schools, he might reasonably expect a profitable sale. This has been disputed by many writers, because none of these editions have been found. But they undoubtedly were published, though without the name of place or printer; as the preceding books at Harleim were printed, and the following ones at Mentz, till the year 1457; and therefore, if any at present remain in the collections of the curious, they are only discoverable to such as are well-acquainted with the types of LAURENTIUS. Nay, it is possible that the copies may be all torn and destroyed, having been used only by school-boys; as hath happened to both the Harleim editions of DONATUS; or the re-

[K] ERASMUS testifies that these tracts were received in schools, when he was a young man, *Ep. ad* HENR. BOUILLUM, Aug. 31, 1513, Opp. tom. III. p. 103. Of this Grammar of ALEXANDER DE VILLA DEI, written in verse, see among others Jo. ALB. FABRICIUS, *Biblioth. Lat. med. et infim. Latinit.* lib. I. and Jo. LEICHIUS in *Supplem.* MAITTAIRII, at the end of *Orig. Typogr. Lipf.* p. 119. *seq.* Of PETER OF SPAIN, who flourished in the close of the XIIIth century, see NICH. ANTONIUS's *Biblioth. Hispan. vet.* lib. VIII. c. 5. p. 52; and of his *Parva Logicalia*, or *Thesaurus Sophismatum*, which JUNIUS here points out, Sir THOMAS MORE's *Apology for the Folly of* ERASMUS deserves to be read, tom. III. Opp. ERASMI, p. 1897, & seq. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 94. B.

mainder

mainder of them were suppressed by the Mentz printers, whose improvement in the art had rendered these books useless: or, if any of them are still remaining, they are hidden in obscurity, as many others of the first essays of printing; some of which Mr. MEERMAN discovered, which none have before mentioned [L]; and more, it is hoped, will be brought to light

[L] In proof of this assertion, Mr. MEERMAN particularly mentions *two editions* of this *Grammar* of ALEXANDER DE VILLA DEI, unknown to Mr. MAITTAIRE and others. One, and that in his own library, without time, place, or printer, beginning with the work itself, *Scribere clericulis paro doctrinale novellis*, was published in quarto in the Roman character, and that *cut*, as appears from the inequality of the type, and contains twenty-eight lines in a page; which may be reckoned, by all the marks, among the first editions printed in Italy, about 1470, or even earlier.

The other, which was shewn to Mr. MEERMAN by Mr. JACOB BRYANT, the celebrated writer on the Mythology of the Ancients, is in folio, in the Roman character, and *cut* too, with some elegance, thirty lines long, and has the following remarkable inscription at the end:

"Alexandri de Villa Dei Doctrinale (Deo laudes) feli-
"citer explicit. Impressum sat incommode. Cum aliqua-
"rum rerum, quæ ad hanc artem pertinent impressori
"copia fieri non potuerit in hujus artis inicio: peste Ge-
"nuæ, Ast, alibique militante. Emendavit autem hoc
"ipsum opus Venturinus Prior, Grammaticus eximius, ita
"diligenter, ut cum antea Doctrinale parum emendatum in
"plerisque locis librariorum vitio esse videretur, nunc illius

will be brought to light, by a comparison with the valuable specimens of early printing, which Mr. MEERMAN's plates exhibit. Nor can any thing material be opposed to JUNIUS's relation, except the silence of JOHN SCHOEFFER of those works, in his narration preserved by TRITHEMIUS. The reason is, he passes over the whole history of *moveable wooden types*, as not worth his notice; and relates only the particulars of *metal types*, first those which had their

"cura et diligentia adhibita in manus hominum quam "emendatissimum veniat. Imprimentur autem posthac libri "alterius generis literis, et eleganter arbitror. Nam et "fabri et aliarum rerum, quarum hactenus promptor in-"digus fuit, illi nunc Dei munere copia est, qui cuncta dis-"ponit pro suæ voluntatis arbitrio. AMEN."

As VENTURINUS dwelt at Florence, and in 1482 published there *the Rudiments of the Latin Grammar*, it is probable this *Doctrinale* was printed in the same place likewise, and by the same artists, who afterwards printed the works of VIRGIL with SERVIUS's *Commentary* in 1472, viz. BERNARD and DOMINICK CENNINI. For if the inscription subjoined to VIRGIL, and to be seen in MAITTAIRE, tom. I. p. 320, be compared with what is above exhibited, it will be manifest that, to print the Prince of Poets, they had got a workman who could cast the letters (for *cast* they were), as they had hopes of getting, they tell us, in the inscription to the *Doctrinale*. Thus this Grammar, by the CENNINI, is the first book printed at Florence; which Dom. MANNI seems not to have known, in his Dissertation on the first impressions at Florence, lately published in the Italian language. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 94, 95. B. & N.

faces *cut on caſt bodies* (which Mr. MEERMAN *at firſt* erroneouſly thought to have been not *caſt* at all, but *cut* out of metal, an opinion he corrects in the concluſion of his work), and afterwards *complete fuſile types*, both firſt uſed at Mentz.

This twofold invention of Printing is what no one has obſerved before Mr. MEERMAN; and yet clears up all the diſputes between Harleim and Mentz; the firſt with *ſeparate wooden types* at Harleim, by LAURENTIUS, about 1430, and after continued by his family; the other with *metal types*, firſt *cut*, and afterwards *caſt*, which were invented at Mentz, but not uſed in Holland, till brought thither by THEODORIC MARTENS at Aloſt [M].

The

[M] This THEODORIC MARTENS, or the ſon of MARTIN, who is frequently mentioned in ERASMUS's Epiſtles, had the following epitaph, in German, put up in the church of the monaſtery of the Wilhelmites at Aloſt: "Here lies "THEODORIC MARTENS, who brought the art of cha-"racteriſing, from Upper Germany and France, to Lower "Germany. He died May 28, 1534."—By *the art of characteriſing* is undoubtedly to be underſtood printing with metal types, as we have ſhewn above, p. 43, note [Z]. So that PROSPER MARCHAND is miſerably miſtaken, when, in his *Lexicon Criticum*, tom. II. p. 29, art. MARTENS, he produces this epitaph as a proof againſt LAURENTIUS being the firſt printer.—The firſt books yet known of MARTENS's printing were at Aloſt, 1473. See MARCHAND, *Hiſt. de l'Imprimerie*, p. 63. But he ſeems to have had ſeveral partners, who came with him into Holland,

The circumſtance of there being two brothers of the name of JOHN GEINSFLEICH will lead us to the meaning of the Poet, in theſe verſes, ſubjoined to the firſt editions of JUSTINIAN's *Inſtitutes*, printed by PETER SCHOEFFER in 1468:

"Hos dedit eximios ſculpendi in arte magiſtros,
Cui placet en mactos arte ſagire viros,
Quos genuit ambos urbs Moguntina JOHANNES,
Librorum inſignes protocharagmaticos,
Cum quibus optatum PETRUS venit ad *Polyandrum*,
Curſor poſterior, introëundo prior;
Quippe quibus præſtat ſculpendi lege, ſagitus
A ſolo dante lumen et ingenium."

By "ambos JOHANNES," all have hitherto thought to be meant FAUSTUS and GUTENBERG, not ſufficiently attending to the firſt two lines, which ſome have left out as needleſs. That FAUSTUS, a man of wealth, practiſed Printing with his own hands, or caſt the types, no one ever dreamt; nor do even thoſe moderns ſay he did, who think he is here meant. It will be difficult, therefore, to perſuade us, that SCHOEFFER, in whoſe praiſe, and with whoſe con-

land, as it is certain Jo. of WESTPHALIA did. See MAITTAIRE, Annal. Typogr. tom. I. p. 334, ed. 2. And ſince MATTHAEUS VAN DER GOES appears a printer at Antwerp 1472, who in that year printed *het boeck van Tondalus viſioen* in quarto, THEODORIC conſequently returned about that period, from Germany and France, into his own country. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 98. B. & N.

ſent, theſe verſes were made, would ſuffer FAUSTUS, his father-in-law, to be complimented for his ſkill in an art to which he had no pretence. The truth is, the two JOHNS are no other than GEINSFLEICH ſenior and GUTENBERG, who were the firſt inventors of *metal types*. And yet Mr. MEERMAN thinks FUST is not wholly unmentioned; ſuſpecting he is hinted at by the word *Polyandrum*, to whom both the GEINSFLEICHES and PETER SCHOEFFER applied as to the common patron of all printers, whom he aſſiſted with his bounty and counſel. He had certainly the ſurname given him of Gutman, or GOODMAN, as Jo. CARION informs us in his *Chronicle*, which name ſeems to be alluded to by a new ſignification of the word *Polyander*, the Aller-man, or one who had *many men* under his direction. *Polyandrum* has been alſo explained by many writers to mean the *penetralia artis*; from a ſuppoſition of its alluding to CHRIST's ſepulchre, which PETER firſt entered, though he came to it after JOHN.—SCHELHORNIUS, however, *Amænit. Liter.* tom. IV. p. 301, ſuſpected ſome *unknown perſon* was here intended [N].

Which of the two brothers invented the *metal types*, hiſtory does not inform us. GEINSFLEICH ſenior had printed in 1442 the *Grammar* of ALEXANDER DE VILLA DEI, and the *Logicalia* of PETER OF SPAIN, on *wooden types*; but, finding them not ſufficiently durable, ſoon ſaw the expediency of uſing *metal*. In 1443 he hired the houſe Zum-jungen, and was aſſiſted with money by FUST, who in return had a ſhare of the buſineſs;

[N] See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 176, 177.

and

and about the ſame time JOHN MEIDENBACHIUS was admitted a partner, as were ſome others, whoſe names are not tranſmitted to our times; and in 1444 they were joined by GUTENBERG, who for that purpoſe quitted Straſburg.

It ſeems likely, therefore, that GEINSFLEICH ſenior firſt thought of uſing *metal types*; but, his eyes failing him, he inſtructed GUTENBERG in his art, which reached no farther than caſting the *ſhanks* of the letters, or little ſquare blocks of *metal*, which (POLYDORE VERGIL tells us) was firſt thought-of in 1442, the very year in which GEINSFLEICH publiſhed his firſt eſſays on *wooden types*, which did not anſwer his expectations. But, ſince the brothers are both called *protocharagmatici*, it is ſafeſt, with WIMPHELINGIUS, to look upon both as the inventors of this improvement.

Whilſt the *metal types* were preparing, which muſt have been a work of time, ſeveral works were printed, both on *wooden ſeparate types* and *wooden blocks*; which were well adapted to ſmall books of frequent uſe, ſuch as the *Tabula Alphabetica*, the *Catholicon*, DONATI *Grammatica*, and the *Confeſſionalia*. Theſe were certainly printed by this partnerſhip, as were alſo ſome *wooden pictures*.

From the abovementioned printers in conjunction, after many ſmaller eſſays, the *Bible* was publiſhed in 1450, with *large cut metal types* [O]. And it is no wonder,

[O] Many writers have ſuppoſed that this was the edition of which ſome copies were ſold in France, by FUST, as manuſcripts, for the great price of five or ſix hundred crowns, which

v. page 165

wonder, considering the immense labour this work cost, that it should be seven or eight years in completing. In this same year the partnership was dissolved; and a new one entered into, in August, between FUST and GUTENBERG; the former supplying money, the latter skill, for their common benefit. Various difficulties arising occasioned a law-suit for the money which FUST had advanced; which was determined against GUTENBERG. A dissolution of this partnership ensued in 1455; and in 1457 a magnificent edition of the *Psalter* was published by FUST and SCHOEFFER, with a remarkable commendation, in which they assumed to themselves the merit of a new invention (viz. of *metal types*), "adinventionem arti-"ficiosam imprimendi ac characterizandi." This book was uncommonly elegant, and in some measure the work of GUTENBERG; as it was four years in the press, and came out but eighteen months after the partnership was dissolved between him and FUST.

p. 166

The latter continued in possession of the printing-office: and GUTENBERG, by the pecuniary assistance of CONRAD HUMERY syndic of Mentz [P], and others,

which he afterwards lowered to sixty, and at last to less than forty. But it was the second and more expensive edition of 1462, that was thus disposed of, when FUST went to Paris in 1466, and which had cost 4000 florins before the third *quaternion* (or quire of four sheets) was printed. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 6. 151, 152. N.

[P] At the death of GUTENBERG, CONRAD HUMERY took possession of all his printing materials: and engaged

others, opened another office in the same city; whence appeared, in 1460, without the printer's name, the *Catholicon* Jo. DE JANUA, with a pompous colophon, in praise of its beauty, and ascribing the honour of the invention to the city of Mentz [Q]. It was

gaged to the Archbishop ADOLPHUS, that he never would sell them to any one but a citizen of Mentz. They were, however, soon disposed of to NICHOLAS BECHTERMUNTZE, of Altavilla, who, in 1469, published *Vocabularium Latino-Teutonicum*, which was printed with the same types which had been used in the *Catholicon*. This very curious and scarce *Vocabulary* was shewn to Mr. MEERMAN, by Mr. BRYANT, in the duke of MARLBOROUGH's valuable library at Blenheim. It is in quarto, thirty-five lines long, contains many extracts from the *Catholicon*, and is called *Ex quo*, from the Preface beginning with those words. See MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 96. N.

[Q] This edition, having been published without a name, has been almost universally ascribed to FUST and SCHOEFFER. But Mr. MEERMAN thinks it was not the work of those printers; 1. because the whole form of their colophons varies from this, and theirs were always printed with *red* ink, and this with *black*; 2. because it has not *their names* to it, which they never omitted after 1457; and, 3. because the shape of the letter is very different from any that they used. As there was no other printing-office at Mentz in 1460 but theirs and GUTENBERG's, Mr. MEERMAN confidently ascribes it to the latter; and accounts very probably for the omission of the printer's name; 1. by the motive of his publication being *profit*, rather than *fame*; and, 2. (which

was a very handſome book, though inferior to the *Pſalter* which had been publiſhed in 1457 by FUST and SCHOEFFER. Both the *Pſalter* and *Catholicon* were printed on *cut metal types* [R]. It may not be improper to obſerve here, that as the *Pſalter* is the earlieſt

(which was a ſtronger reaſon) left his claim to the invention ſhould be contradicted by SCHOEFFER, who was then living in the ſame city. The laſt motive ſeems to have had its uſe; for SCHOEFFER never took any public notice of it, till he publiſhed the *Inſtitutiones* JUSTINIANI in 1468, where he informs his readers, that the two GEINSFLEICHES, though very ſkilful men, had not arrived to ſo great perfection in the art as himſelf. See above, p. 83. This was the firſt edition of the *Catholicon* JO. DE JANUA; that which was printed by GEINSFLEICH with *wooden types* (ſee above, p. 85) being only a *ſmall Vocabulary* for the uſe of ſchools. The Straſburgh edition, by MENTELIUS, which was publiſhed likewiſe without a name, was not printed till long after, probably not before 1469. See MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 96. 99.—A copy of the *Catholicon* was purchaſed at Dr. MEAD's auction for 25 *l.* 15 *s.* for the French king; who had given a commiſſion to bid 150 *l.* for it. Mr. WEST's copy was ſold for 35 *l.* 3 *s.* 6 *d.* and is now in the Royal Library. Dr. ASKEW's, which appeared to be a very beautiful copy, was ſaid to be *not* the FIRST Edition, and one of the leaves was written: it ſold for 14 *l.* 10 *s.* N.

[R] GUTENBERG never uſed any other than either *wooden* or *cut metal types* till the year 1462. In 1465 he was admitted *inter Aulicos* by the Elector ADOLPHUS, with an annual penſion; and died in February 1468. His elder brother GEINSFLEICH died in 1462. Their epitaphs are printed by Mr. MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 154. 295. N.

book

book which is known to have a genuine date, it became a common practice, after that publication, for printers to claim their own performances, by adding their names to them.

The progreſs of the art has been thus traced through its *ſecond* period, the invention of *cut metal types*. But the honour of *completing* the diſcovery is due to PETER SCHOEFFER [S] *de Gernſheim*.

A very clear account of this final completion of the types is preſerved by TRITHEMIUS [T]: "Poſt "hæc inventis ſucceſſerunt ſubtiliora, inveneruntque "modum *fundendi formas* omnium Latini alphabeti

[S] In German, Schoeffer; in Latin, OPILIO; in Engliſh, SHEPHERD.—He is ſuppoſed by Mr. MEERMAN to have been the firſt ENGRAVER on Copper Plates. The Poet, whoſe verſes we have cited in p. 84, ſays of him,

"Natio quæque ſuum poterit reperire charagma
"Secum; nempe ſtylo præminet omnigeno."

It is not quite certain, however, as Mr. MEERMAN obſerves, whether this is meant for a compliment to his ſkill in what is now called ENGRAVING; it may perhaps mean only that he was able to *cut types* to repreſent all languages. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 253. N.

[T] Annales Hirſaugienſes, tom. II. ad ann. 1450, p. 421. As this book was finiſhed in 1514, and TRITHEMIUS tells us, he had the narrative from SCHOEFFER himſelf about thirty years before; this will bring us back to 1484, when SCHOEFFER muſt have been advanced in years, and TRITHEMIUS about twenty-two years old, who died in 1516. See Voſſ. Hiſt. Lat. l. III. c. 10. FABR. Med. & Infim. Ætat. l. IX. B.

" literarum [U], quas ipsi *matrices* nominabant; ex
" quibus rursum æneos sive stanneos characteres funde-
" bant, ad omnem pressuram sufficientes, quos prius
" manibus sculpebant. Et revera sicuti *ante* xxx *ferme*
" *annos* ex ore Petri Opilionis de Gernsheim, civis Mo-
" guntini, qui gener erat primi artis inventoris, audivi,
" magnam a primo inventionis suæ hæc ars impressoria
" habuit difficultatem.—Petrus autem memoratus Opi-
" lio, tunc famulus postea gener, sicut diximus, inven-
" toris primi, Johannis Fust, homo ingeniosus et pru-
" dens, faciliorem modum *fundendi characteres* excogi-
" tavit, et artem, ut nunc est, complevit."

[U] Mr. MEERMAN (vol. II. p. 47.) supposes there is an
error in this passage, and that it should be read, " fundendi
" formas omnium Latini alphabeti literarum [EX IIS] quas
" ipsi *matrices* nominabant;" and explains it to mean, " That
" they found out a method *fundendi formas* (that is, of *casting*
" *the bodies* only) of all the letters of the Latin alphabet, FROM
" WHAT *they called matrices* (on which they *cut the face* of each
" letter); and *from the same kind of matrices* a method was in
" time discovered of casting the *complete letters* (*æneos sive*
" *stanneos characteres*) of sufficient hardness for the pressure
" they had to bear, which letters before (that is, when the *bo-*
" *dies only were cast*) they were obliged to *cut*." But this inter-
pretation is itself *obscure*; and, with submission, the passage
from TRITHEMIUS needs no correction. The simple sense is,
That a mode was invented of *stamping the shape of the letters*
in *matrices*, from which were *cast* the *complete types*.—The
first operation of the Founder at present is, to cut the *face* of
the letter on a *steel punch*; this he strikes into a *copper matrix*;
and from *matrices* the *metal types* are cast, without any further
process. See Mr. DE MISSY's remark on this passage, at the
end of the Appendix. N.

Another

Another ample testimony in favour of SCHOEFFER is given by JO. FRID. FAUSTUS of Aschaffenburg, from papers preserved in his family: "PETER "SCHOEFFER of Gernsheim, perceiving his master "FUST's design, and being himself ardently desirous "to improve the art, found out (by the good pro-"vidence of God) the method of cutting *(incidendi)* "the characters in a *matrix*, that the letters might "each be singly *cast*, instead of being *cut*. He pri-"vately *cut matrices* for the whole alphabet; "and, when he shewed his master the letters cast "from these matrices, FUST was so pleased with the "contrivance, that he promised PETER to give him "his only daughter CHRISTINA in marriage; a pro-"mise which he soon after performed. But there "were as many difficulties at first with these let-"ters, as there had been before with *wooden* ones; "the metal being too soft to support the force of the "impression: but this defect was soon remedied, by "mixing the metal with a substance which suffi-"ciently hardened it." This account has the more probability in it, as coming from a relation of FUST, yet ascribing the merit to SCHOEFFER [X]. It agrees too with what JOHN SCHOEFFER tells us [Y], "that "in 1452 FUST completed the art, by the help of

[X] See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 183. who copied this testimony from WOLFIUS, Monument. Typograph. vol. I. p. 468, seq. N.

[Y] In a colophon to the *Breviarium* TRITHEMII. See MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 144. N.

" his servant PETER SCHOEFFER, whom he adopted " for his son, and to whom he gave his daughter " CHRISTINA [Z] in marriage, *pro dignâ laborum* " *multarumque adinventionum remuneratione.*—FUST " and SCHOEFFER concealed this new improvement, " by administering an oath of secrecy to all whom " they intrusted, till the year 1462; when, by the " dispersion of their servants into different countries, " at the sacking of Mentz by the archbishop ADOL- " PHUS, the invention was publicly divulged."

The first book printed with these *improved types* was DURANDI *Rationale*, in 1459; at which time, however, they seem to have had only *one size* of *cast* letters, all the larger characters which occur being *cut types*, as appears plainly by an inspection of the book [AA]. From this time to 1466, FUST and SCHOEFFER

[Z] It is somewhat remarkable that JOHN SCHOEFFER should be mistaken in his mother's *name*; which, however, Mr. MEERMAN thinks he was, since his father (in a contract made in 1477, with his kinsman FUST, about twenty copies in vellum, and 180 in paper, of the *Decretals* of Gregory IX, being the residue of an impression printed in 1473) expresly calls his wife Dynen, i. e. DINAH; which KÖHLERUS, who has printed this contract, supposes to be a diminutive of CHRISTINA: though DINAH (or DEBORAH) is a very different name from CHRISTINA, MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 184. But see Mr. DE MISSY's very ingenious Remarks at the end of our Appendix. N.

[AA] MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 98.—When Dr. ASKEW's fine copy of DURANDUS was on sale, a doubt was started, whether

SCHOEFFER continued to print a considerable number of books; particularly the two famous editions of TULLY'S *Offices*, of which we have already given an account, p. 59. In their earliest books, they printed more copies on *vellum* than on *paper*, which was the case both of their *Bibles* and TULLY'S *Offices*. This, however, was soon inverted; and *paper* introduced for the greatest part of their impressions: a few only being printed on *vellum*, for curiosities, and for the purpose of being *illuminated* [BB]. How long FUST lived, is uncertain; but in 1471 we find SCHOEFFER was in partnership with CONRAD HENLIF and a kinsman of his master FUST [CC]. He published many books after the death of his father-in-law [DD]; the last of which that can be discovered is a third edition of the *Psalter* in 1490, in which the old *cut* types of the first edition were used [EE].

whether it was *compleat*, as it did not begin exactly in the manner described by M. DE BURE. It sold, however, for 61 *l.*—How far it corresponded with M. DE BURE's account, I cannot pretend to say, having had no opportunity of examining that particular; but, on a close inspection into the book on a former occasion, I have every reason to think Mr. MEERMAN's account of it to be perfectly exact. Dr. ASKEW's copy was on vellum, and bound in two volumes. N.

[BB] Ibid. vol. I. p. 8. [CC] Ibid. p. 7.

[DD] SCHWARZIUS, *Primar. Docum. de Orig. Typogr.* par. II. p. 4. has enumerated *forty-eight* books (*omnes grandiori forma*) printed by SCHOEFFER before 1492. And Mr. MEERMAN adds still more to that number, vol. I. p. 253. N.

[EE] MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 52.

This

This Dissertation shall be closed with a short account of the claim of *Strasburgh*. It has been already mentioned, that GUTENBERG was engaged in that city in different employments; and, among others, in endeavouring to attain the art of Printing [FF]. That these endeavours were unsuccessful, is plain from an authentic judicial decree of the senate of Strasburgh, in 1439, after the death of ANDREW DRIZEHEN [GG].

But there are many other proofs that GUTENBERG and his partners were never able to bring the art to perfection.

[FF] See above, p. 76, note [I].

[GG] Their first attempts were made about 1436, with *wooden types*. Mr. MEERMAN is of opinion that GRINSFLEICH junior (who was of an enterprizing genius, and had already engaged in a variety of projects) gained some little insight into the business by visiting his brother, who was employed by LAURENTIUS at Harleim, but not sufficient to enable him to practise it. It is certain, that, at the time of the law-suit in 1439, much money had been expended, without any profit having arisen; and the unfortunate DRIZEHEN, in 1438, on his death-bed, lamented to his confessor, that he had been at great expence, without having been reimbursed a single *obolus*. Nor did GUTENBERG (who persisted in his fruitless endeavours) reap any advantage from them; for, when he quitted Strasburg, he was overwhelmed in debt, and under a necessity of selling every thing he was in possession of. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 198—202. All the depositions in the law-suit above-mentioned (with the judicial decree) are printed by Mr. MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 58—88. N.

I. WIM-

1. WIMPHELINGIUS [HH], the oldeſt writer in favour of Straſburg, tells us, that GUTENBERG was the inventor of "a new art of writing," *ars impreſſoria*, which might almoſt be called a divine benefit, and which he happily completed at Mentz; but does not mention one book of his printing: though he adds, that MENTELIUS printed many volumes correctly and beautifully, and acquired great wealth: whence we may conclude that he perfected what GUTENBERG had in vain eſſayed.

2. WIMPHELINGIUS, in another book [II], tells us, the art of Printing was found out by GUTENBERG *incompletè*; which implies, not that he practiſed the art in an imperfect manner (as LAURENTIUS had done at Harleim), but rather that he had not been able to accompliſh what he aimed at.

3. GUTENBERG, when he left Straſburg in 1444 or the following year, and entered into partnerſhip with GEINSFLEICH ſenior and others, had occaſion for his brother's aſſiſtance, to enable him to complete the art; which ſhews that his former attempts at Straſburg had been unſuccesſful [KK].

4. Theſe particulars are remarkably confirmed by TRITHEMIUS, who tells us, in two different places [LL],

[HH] *Epitome rerum Germanicarum*, ed. Argent. 1505. MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 202. vol. II. p. 139.

[II] *Catal. Epiſc. Argentin.* 1508. MEERMAN, ut ſupra.

[KK] MEERMAN, ut ſupra.

[LL] *Annal. Hirſaug.* ut ſupra, & *Chron. Spanheim.* See MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 103. 127.

that

that GUTENBERG ſpent all his ſubſtance in queſt of this art; and met with ſuch inſuperable difficulties, that, in deſpair, he had nearly given up all hopes of attaining it, till he was aſſiſted by the liberality of FUST, and by his brother's ſkill, in the city of Mentz.

5. ULRIC ZELL ſays [MM], the art was completed at Mentz; but that ſome books had been publiſhed in Holland earlier than in that city. Is it likely that ZELL, who was a German, would have omitted to mention Straſburgh, if it had preceded Mentz in Printing?

There is little doubt therefore that all GUTENBERG's labours at Straſburgh amounted to no more than a fruitleſs attempt, which he was at laſt under a neceſſity of relinquiſhing: and there is no certain proof of a ſingle book having been printed in that city till after the diſperſion of the printers in 1462 [NN], when

[MM] *Chronicon Coloniæ*, 1499. ZELL attributes the invention to GUTENBERG at Mentz; whence, he ſays, the art was firſt communicated to Cologn, next to Straſburgh, and then to Venice. See MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 105.

[NN] From this period, Printing made a rapid progreſs in moſt of the principal towns of Europe, as will appear by an inſpection of our Appendix, N° IV *. In 1490, it reached Conſtantinople; and, according to Mr. PALMER, p. 281, &c. it was extended, by the middle of the next century, to Africa and America. It was introduced into Ruſſia about 1560; but, from motives either of policy or ſuperſtition, it was ſpeedily ſuppreſſed by the ruling powers; and, even

* This number of the Appendix appears now for the firſt time.

when MENTELIUS and EGGESTENIUS successfully pursued the business. The former indeed is supposed by some writers to have begun printing about the year 1447; but no sufficient authority appears for such an assertion.

Having mentioned MENTELIUS, let us examine for a moment how he comes to be considered as the inventor of Printing. The origin of the art was known to very few. The advocates for Mentz were divided in their sentiments between GUTENBERG and FUST. The city of Strasburgh put in its own claim to the invention; and GUTENBERG's failure of success there, cutting off all pretence to the honour of it, opened a way for MENTELIUS, who certainly was the first publisher of books in that city. JOHN SCHOTTUS, a son of MENTELIUS's daughter, settled there in 1510, after having resided at Friburg in Basil, and took an opportunity of cultivat-

under the present enlightened Empress, has scarcely emerged from its obscurity.—That it was early practised in the inhospitable regions of Iceland, we have the respectable authority of Mr. BRYANT: "ARNGRIM JONAS was born amidst "the snows of *Iceland*; yet as much prejudiced in favour of his "country as those who are natives of an happier climate. This "is visible in his *Crymogæa*; but more particularly in his "*Anatome Blefkiniana*. I have in my possession this curious "little treatise, written in Latin by him in his own country, "and printed *Typis Holensibus in Islandiâ Boreali, anno* 1612. "*Hola* is placed in some maps within the *Arctic* Circle, and is "certainly not far removed from it. I believe, it is the "farthest North of any place, where Arts and Sciences have "ever resided." *Observations and Inquiries relating to various parts of Ancient History*, 1767, p. 277. B. & N.

ing a report which was likely to prove so advantageous to him among his countrymen. He was more particularly excited to this, by JOHN SCHOEFFER, of Mentz; who boasted in his colophons, though not quite consistently with truth, that JOHN FUST, his grandfather by the mother's side, was the first inventor [OO]. As Strasburgh rivaled Mentz in its claim, why should SCHOTTUS give place to SCHOEFFER, or why MENTELIUS to FUST? If SCHOEFFER used artifice on one side, SCHOTTUS shewed more on

[OO] JOHN SCHOEFFER was the first who attributed the invention to FUST; not, as other writers do, by saying that he assisted the first printers with money and advice; but imputing it to *his own ingenuity*. He did not, however, venture to assert so much at once, but artfully proceeded to it by degrees. In his first colophon, 1503*, he ascribes it *majoribus suis*, without naming them. In a dedication to the Emperor MAXIMILIAN, in 1505, he ingenuously calls GUTENBERG the inventor, and FUST and SCHOEFFER the improvers. In 1509, he calls his grandfather *inventorem auctoremque*; and in 1515, in the colophon to TRITHEMIUS, which is above cited, he asserts that FUST completed the art with the assistance of PETER SCHOEFFER. By a continual repetition of colophons to this purpose, many were persuaded that the assertion was true, and among others, it seems, the Emperor MAXIMILIAN (see above, p. 14); to whom, however, in 1505, JOHN SCHOEFFER had given a very different account. See MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 144. N.

* The colophon to "Hermetis Pimander," 1503, is, "Impressum & "expletum est divinissimum presens opusculum in nobili urbe Magun-"tina, Artis Impressorie inventrice illuminatriceque prima — per JOAN "SCHOEFFER." ASK. Cat. N° 1719.

the

the other. The former, without any teſtimony but his own repeated confident aſſertions, drew over many in favour of FUST, leaving GUTENBERG out of the queſtion; and, among others, even the Emperor MAXIMILIAN, who, in 1518, granted SCHOEFFER *an excluſive privilege* of printing LIVY. SCHOTTUS was ſilent while this Emperor lived; but no ſooner was he dead, than he endeavoured to perſuade his ſucceſſor CHARLES V, and the reſt of the learned world, that FUST ſhould be diveſted of his imaginary claims, and MENTELIUS be put in his place. To this purpoſe, from the year 1520, he prefixed his family arms to all the books he printed, which had been granted, by FREDERICK III, to his grandfather and deſcendants; adding to them an inſcription, "that they were granted to JOHN MENTELIUS, "*the firſt inventor of Printing.*" But the truth is, coat-armour had before been granted by that emperor to the *typothetæ* and the *typographi*, to perpetuate the diſcovery [PP]; but to MENTELIUS he granted them only as a private man who was deſirous of nobility, and the diploma contained not a word of the invention of Printing: nor did SCHOTTUS dare openly to aſſert that it was granted to MENTELIUS for the invention of the art, leſt he ſhould be detected in a falſehood; but was content, by uſing an ambiguous expreſſion, to miſlead inattentive readers [QQ].

[PP] See above, p. 69, note [F].

[QQ] MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 205, & ſeq.

APPENDIX to the SECOND ESSAY.

N° I.

On the first-printed GREEK Books.

IT cannot be thought foreign to our plan, to give a short account of the invention of those *characters* by which the learned languages have been perpetuated, and particularly the Greek and Hebrew.

The first essays in GREEK that can be discovered are in the few sentences which occur in the famous edition of TULLY's *Offices*, 1465, at Mentz, which we have already described; but these were miserably incorrect and barbarous, if we may judge from the specimens Mr. MAITTAIRE has given us [*a*], of which the following is one:

Οτίcαταακαρτμακατα *καὶ* τατωτωκα.

In the same year, 1465, was published an edition of LACTANTIUS's *Institutes*, printed *in monasteria Sublacensi*, in the kingdom of Naples, in which the quotations from the Greek authors are printed in a very neat Greek letter [*b*]. Mr. MEERMAN observes, that there is *a very striking difference* between the Greek used in *Lactantius* and that of *Mentz*; as there is also in the types with which *the Latin* is printed.

[*a*] Vol. I. p. 61. & Pars posterior, p. 274.
[*b*] PALMER, Hist. of Printing, p. 124.

They

They seem to have had but *a very small quantity* of Greek types in the monastery; for, in the first part of the work, whenever a long sentence occurred, a blank was left, that it might be written-in with a pen; after the middle of the work, however, all the Greek that occurs is printed [*c*].

The first printers who settled at Rome were CONRAD SWEYNHEIM and ARNOLD PANNARTZ, who introduced the present *Roman* type, in 1467, in CICERO's *Epistolæ Familiares*: in 1469 they printed a beautiful edition of AULUS GELLIUS, with the Greek quotations in a fair character, without accents or spirits, and with very few abbreviations [*d*].

It

[*c*] Before this period, the uniform character was the old *Gothic*, or *German*; whence our *Black* was afterwards formed. But *Lactantius* is printed in a kind of Semi-gothic, of great elegance, and approaching nearly to the present *Roman* type; which last was first used at Rome in 1467, and soon after brought to great perfection in Italy, particularly by JENSON. See MEERMAN, vol. II. p. 248. N.

[*d*] After having printed, in six or seven years at most, a great number of very beautiful and correct editions, these ingenious printers were reduced to the most necessitous circumstances. Their learned patron the Bishop of ALERIA (who was the editor of AULUS GELLIUS) presented a petition to Pope Sixtus IV, in 1471, in behalf of "these worthy "and industrious printers;" in which he represents their great merit and misery, in the most pathetic terms; and declares their readiness to part with their whole stock for subsistence. "We were the first of the Germans (they say) "who introduced this art, with vast labour and cost, into "your

It appears then that ſome conſiderable fragments of Greek were very early introduced into printed books; but the firſt whole book that is yet known is the Greek Grammar of CONSTANTINE LASCARIS, in quarto, reviſed by DEMETRIUS CRETENSIS, and printed by DIONYSIUS PALAVISINUS, at Milan, 1476 [e].

In 1481, the Greek *Pſalter* was printed in that city, with a Latin tranſlation, in folio [f]: as was Æſop's

" your Holineſs's territories, in the time of your predeceſſor: " and encouraged, by our example, other printers to do the " ſame. If you peruſe the catalogue of the works printed by " us, you will admire how and where we could procure a ſuf- " ficient quantity of paper, or even rags, for ſuch a number " of volumes.—The total of theſe books amounts to 12,475; " a prodigious heap, and intolerable to us, your Holineſs's " printers, by reaſon of thoſe unſold. We are no longer able " to bear the great expence of houſe-keeping, for want of " buyers; of which there cannot be a more flagrant proof, " than that our houſe, though otherwiſe ſpacious enough, is " full of *Quire-books*, but void of every neceſſary of life." The curious Reader may ſee the whole of this intereſting petition, which is dated March 1, 1472, with the catalogue of their books, in PALMER, p. 130, &c. who has tranſlated it from CHEVILLIER. See alſo MAITTAIRE, vol. I. p. 46. & Pars poſterior, p. 276. N.

[e] PALMER, p. 215. See Mr. DE MISSY's note, in p. 104. Dr. ASKEW's copy of this Grammar ſold for 21 *l.* 10 *s.* N.

[f] LE LONG, Bibliotheca Sacra, p. 436. A fine copy of this edition was purchaſed by Mr. DE MISSY, with many other valuable books, at the ſale of the Harleian Library. Dr. ASKEW's copy of it ſold for 16 *l.* 16 *s.* N.

Fables

Fables in quarto; a copy of which Dr. HUNTER bought, at Dr. ASKEW's ſale, for 6*l.* 6*s.*

Venice [*g*] ſoon followed the example of Milan; and in 1486 were publiſhed in that city the *Greek Pſalter* and the *Batrachomyomachia*, the former by ALEXANDER, the latter by LAONICUS, both natives of Crete. They were printed in a very uncommon character; the latter of them with *accents* and *ſpirits*, and alſo with *ſcholia* [*h*].

In

[*g*] In an edition of PLINY's Natural Hiſtory, printed by Jo. DE SPIRA in 1469 (ſee above, p. 45), a Greek inſcription, l. vii. c. 58, is thus miſerably miſ-printed in Roman letters, "xaxilipcui canece comai cockpturæ trata una ciezica," inſtead of Ναυσικράτης Τισαμένε Ἀθηναῖος Κόρῃ καὶ Ἀθηνᾷ ἀνέθηκεν. CHISHULL, Antiq. Aſiat. p. 20. A copy of this edition (which HARDUIN ſeems not to have known of, and which is the more valuable for preſerving this ſignal mark of ignorance in the editor) was in Dr. MEAD's magnificent library; whence it came into the curious collection of another Gentleman who was equally an ornament to Literature and to Medicine, the learned Dr. ASKEW; and, after his death, was ſold for 43*l.* to THE BRITISH MUSEUM. This book, containing 750 pages, was printed in the ſhort ſpace of three months. See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 15. N.

[*h*] MAITTAIRE, vol. I. p. 182.—Dr. ASKEW had a fine copy of this very ſcarce book, which was ſold to Dr. HUNTER for 14*l.* 5*s.* Lord OXFORD had offered Mr. MAITTAIRE 50 guineas for that identical copy.—"If MAITTAIRE left "it a matter of doubt whether the *Pſalter* has *accents* and "*ſpirits*, it muſt be becauſe he had not ſeen the book: for it "has them certainly in my copy; nor do I remember they "were wanting in the only one I ever ſaw beſides, I mean "the

In 1488, however, all former publications in this language were eclipsed by a fine edition of HOMER's works at Florence, in folio, printed by DEMETRIUS, a native of *Crete* [*i*]. Thus Printing (says Mr. MAITTAIRE, p. 185.) seems to have attained its ἀκμὴ of perfection, after having exhibited most beautiful specimens of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew.

" the copy which, if I mistake not, was purchased for *three* " *guineas and a half* by Dr. ASKEW from Dr. MEAD's Li- " brary. As to the *types* (whether cast or cut, for I have " some scruples about it) they may be called a rough, though " not altogether unlike imitation of those MSS. *medii ævi*, " such as some in my possession, which I look upon as writ- " ten by a purely Greek hand, and not with a pen, but with " a reed. I had formerly (but gave them to Dr. ASKEW, " who in return *promised* me some other trifling literary fa- " vour) a few leaves of an ancient printed book * which I " guessed was LASCARIS's or GAZA's Greek Grammar; " and the impression of which, as it then seemed to me, re- " sembled very much *that* of the Psalter in question. A more " imperfect resemblance of its coeval *Batrachomyomachia*, " may be seen in the engraved specimen of it which was " drawn, I suppose, by MAITTAIRE himself, and published " with his edition of that Poem, *anno* 1721." C. D. M.

[*i*] A copy of this very beautiful edition, in fine preservation, is in the NORFOLK Library, among the valuable collection of the ROYAL SOCIETY. Dr. ASKEW had another copy, which was purchased, at the price of 17 *l.* for THE BRITISH MUSEUM. N.

* Possibly those sold to Dr. HUNTER, with " Manutii Rudimenta " Linguæ Græcæ, *Venet.* 1594," for 5 *l.* 10 *s.* N.

In 1493, a fine edition of ISOCRATES [*k*] was printed at *Milan*, in folio, by HENRY GERMAN and SEBASTIAN EX PANTREMULO.

All the above works are prior in time to those of ALDUS, who has been erroneously supposed to be the *first* Greek Printer: the beauty, however, correctness, and number, of his editions place him in a much higher rank than his predecessors [*l*]; and his characters in general were more elegant than any before used. He was born in 1445, and died in 1515 [*m*].

[*k*] See PALMER, p. 158.—An illuminated copy of this work was purchased for the THE BRITISH MUSEUM, at Dr. ASKEW's sale, for ten guineas and a half. N.

[*l*] It would be endless to enumerate the various works of this distinguished Printer. It may be proper, however, to mention his very curious edition of the *Psalter*, which is without date, but is clearly fixed by Mr. MAITTAIRE either to the year 1495 or 1496. Mr. DE MISSY had a fine copy of it, which was sold to Mr. MASON for seven pounds. N.

[*m*] ALDUS was inventor of the *Italic* character which is now in use, called, from his name, *Aldine*, or *Cursivus*. This sort of letter he contrived, to prevent the great number of abbreviations that were then in use; a singular specimen of which is faithfully exhibited by CHEVILLIER *: "Sic̃ hic ẽ fal̃ s̃m q̃d ad simpl̃r a ẽ ꝑducibile a Deo "g̃ a ẽ & sl̃r hic a ñ ẽ g̃ a ñ ẽ ꝑducibile a Do." *i. e.* "Sicut hic est fallacia secundùm quid ad simpliciter. "A est producibile a Deo: Ergo A est. Et similiter hic. "A non est: Ergo A non est producibile a Deo." Contractions of a similar nature abounded in all the works of that age, and more particularly in the books of law. N.

* From "La Logique d'Okam, 1488," fol.

This article ſhould properly cloſe here: but it would be unpardonable not to mention the celebrated family of STEPHENS; whoſe impreſſions, in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, are well known. Though the noble Greek books of ALDUS had raiſed an univerſal deſire of reviving that tongue, the French were backward in introducing it. The only pieces printed by them were ſome quotations, ſo wretchedly performed, that they were rather to be gueſſed at than read [n]; in a character very rude and uncouth, and without accents. But FRANCIS TISSARD introduced the ſtudy of this language at Paris, by his Βίβλος ἡ γραμματικὴ, in 1507 [o]; and that branch of printing was afterwards ſucceſsfully practiſed by HENRY, ROBERT, and HENRY STEPHENS.

The earlieſt Greek edition of the *whole Bible* was, ſtrictly ſpeaking, the COMPLUTENSIAN Polyglott of

[n] This is ſaid on the authority of PALMER, p. 270.—"The father of ROBERT was alſo named HENRY, and was "perhaps the firſt that began to print Greek quotations in "ſuch a manner that they could not be ſaid to be *wretchedly* "*performed, and rather to be gueſſed at than read.* I judge of "this by his edition of *Fabri Stapulenſis Quincuplex Pſalterium*, "printed at Paris, and publiſhed in 1513." C. D. M. Mr. DE MISSY's copy of this Pſalter was ſold to THE ROYAL LIBRARY, for two guineas.—ROBERT STEPHENS had the advantage of being aſſiſted in the correction of his Greek books by his brother CHARLES, who was a good printer, though a phyſician by profeſſion; and had alſo the help of another learned brother, named FRANCIS. N.

[o] CHEVILLIER ſuppoſes that TISSARD, who had alſo the honour of introducing the uſe of Hebrew into France, died in 1508. N.

Cardinal XIMENES [p]; but as that edition, though finished in 1517, was not published till 1522; the *Venetian*

[p] See hereafter, p. 128. 153—162.—And see an account of the early Greek and Latin editions both of the Old and New Testament in LE LONG's Bibliotheca Sacra.—Mr. MAITTAIRE, however, Annal. Typogr. t. I. p. 41, mentions a Latin Bible, of Paris, unnoticed by LE LONG, which is without a date; but is fixed by [Mr. BARRICAVE] a learned friend of Mr. MAITTAIRE's to the year 1464, the third year of the reign of LOUIS the Eleventh, from the three following verses printed in a colophon at the end of it:

"Jam semi Undecimus lustrum Francos LODOICUS
"Rexerat, ULRICUS, MARTINUS, itémque MICHAEL
"Orti Teutoniâ hanc mihi composuere figuram."

Mr. PALMER, History of Printing, p. 100, after citing the above conjecture, adds, "I am persuaded that Mr. MAITTAIRE's friend was mistaken in the first verse. As CHEVILLIER gives us the same colophon at the end of the first Paris Bible by the same three partners, with this variation however from the former, that instead of *semi lustrum*, it has *tribus lustris*, that is, instead of the *third*, it imports the *thirteenth* year of that King's reign: we may easily suppose, that it was the first Paris Bible of 1475; and this Gentleman might probably be mistaken: however, the book being in Queen's College library, in Cambridge, it may be easily consulted." We have the authority of the very learned and accurate Dr. TAYLOR in MS. to assert, that "Mr. MAITTAIRE's friend was *not mistaken* *. The verses are as quoted by Mr. MAITTAIRE, *semi lustrum*, not *tribus lustris*;" and, that "the book is not in Queen's College Library, but in "the

* Dr TAYLOR's positive assertion is as positively overthrown, by two *more recent* examinations; which we shall take the liberty of inserting in our Appendix, in the words of the Gentlemen who favoured us with them.

Venetian Septuagint of 1518 [q] may properly be called the first edition of the *whole* Greek Bible; ERASMUS having published the New Testament *only*, at Basil, in 1516.

" the Library of the University, in that part of it which was " given by King George I."—We shall just mention occasionally, as it falls in our way, another very scarce Latin Bible published by SERVETUS, whence Dr. GREGORY SHARPE cites a note of SERVETUS, in his *Second Argument*, &c. and of which he says, p. 254, *The Jesuits at Lions, when I enquired after this book, did not know that it ever had been published: and Mr. Arkenholtz, a very learned and ingenious man, the librarian at Hesse Cassel, where the works of Servetus a supposed to be preserved, though the* CHRISTIANISMUS RESTITUTUS *is lost, having been stolen out of the library, when the Landgrave himself was present, did not, till I convinced him, believe that Servetus ever published an edition of the Bible.* In Dr. MEAD's Catalogue, p. 3, this edition is intituled, *Biblia Sacra ex Pagnini translatione, per* MICH. VILLANOVANUM, i. e. SERVETUM, *Lugduni*, 1542, *folio.* B. & N.—" If Dr. " SHARPE's intention in this note was only, as I suppose, to " make his Readers sensible how scarce a book that Bible is " from which he quoted a passage, it may be but seconding his " intention to observe, that *his* copy, Dr. MEAD's copy, and " *my* copy of it, are but *one: his* copy being that which he " had borrowed of me, and *mine* being no other than Dr. " MEAD's; which I purchased when his library was sold by " auction in 1754." C. D. M.—For Seven Pounds, as appears by a Catalogue in which the prices are marked. This Bible now forms part of Dr. HUNTER's noble collection; who bought it, at Mr. DE MISSY's sale, for ten guineas. N.

[q] This beautiful edition * *(Venetiis, in ædibus Aldi & Asulani soceri ejus)* was begun by ALDUS, and completed after his death under the inspection of ANDREW ASULANUS, who had long been the corrector of ALDUS's press. N.

* See hereafter, p. 169; and MAITTAIRE, vol. II. p. 133.

N°

N° II.

On the first-printed HEBREW Books: with Observations on some modern Editions; and a Collation, from WALTON's Polyglott, of a remarkable passage, as printed in *Kings* and *Chronicles*.

A VERY satisfactory account of this branch of Printing is thus given by a Gentleman whose learned labours have for many years been constantly employed in elucidating the Hebrew Scriptures [*a*]:

"The method which seems to have been originally "observed, in printing the Hebrew Bible, was just "what might have been expected:

"I. The PENTATEUCH, in 1482 [*b*].

"II. The PRIOR PROPHETS, in 1484 [*c*].

"III. The POSTERIOR PROPHETS, in 1486 [*d*].

"IV. The

[*a*] Dr. KENNICOTT, in *Ten Annual Accounts of the Collation of Hebrew MSS.* p. 112. In the Doctor's Plan for printing a corrected Bible (dated Dec. 16, 1772) an edition of the *Psalms* is mentioned, so early as 1477. N.

[*b*] A copy of this edition is preserved at Verona. Another copy of it is in the curious Library of the Margrave of BADEN DURLAC. See *Annual Accounts*, p. 112. N.

[*c*] This edition (containing *Joshua*, *Judges*, and *Samuel*) Dr. KENNICOTT saw in the Royal Library at Paris. N.

[*d*] This edition contained the *Prophetæ priores* and *posteriores*, according to WOLFIUS, Biblioth. Hebraica, vol. II. p. 397.

"IV. The HAGIOGRAPHA, in 1487 [e].

"And, after the FOUR great parts had been thus "printed separately (each with a comment), THE "WHOLE TEXT (without a comment) was printed in "one volume in 1488 [f]: and the text continued to be "printed,

397. See Dr. KENNICOTT's State of the printed Hebrew Text, Differt. II. p. 472. It was printed at *Soncino*, in the dutchy of Milan, without vowel points, cum Com. DAVID KIMCHI, fol. See LE LONG, Bibliotheca Sacra, p. 129; and PALMER, p. 249. N.

[e] Printed at Naples in 1487. A copy of the *Hagiographa*, in two volumes, on vellum, was presented by Dr. PELLET to Eaton College Library. It contains many curious readings, different from all the other printed copies, and contrary to the *Masora*. The last is probably one of the reasons for which the whole edition may have been destroyed excepting this copy, which had the singular good fortune to escape the flames. Dr. PELLET says, *Hoc exemplar unicum, & flammis ereptum, uti par est credere.* This edition however is printed with the vowel points, except one whole page of *Daniel*. See Dr. KENNICOTT, Diss. I. p. 521. Diss. II. p. 473.—Another copy has been since discovered, in the *Cesanatensian* library at Rome. See *Annual Collations*, p. 112. N.

[f] Printed at Soncino, with vowel points, by ABRAHAM fil. Rabbi HHAJIM, fol. See LE LONG, p 96, where is a particular enumeration of all the principal editions till the year 1709. The whole of the *New Testament* was first published in Hebrew by ELIAS HUTTER in 1599, in a Polyglott edition, which will be described in our Appendix, N° III. B. & N. "But long enough before this, at "Basil,

"printed, as in these first editions, so in several others "for twenty or thirty years, without marginal *Keri* "or *Masora*, and with greater agreement to the more "antient Mss.; till, about the year 1520, some of "the Jews adopted *later* Mss. and the *Masora*; which "absurd preference has obtained ever since."

Thus much for the *ancient* editions given by Jews.

In 1742, a Hebrew Bible was printed at Mantua, under the care of the most learned Jews in Italy. This Bible had not been heard of among the Christians in this country, nor perhaps in any other; though the nature of it is very extraordinary. The text indeed is nearly the same with that in other modern editions: but at the bottom of each page are Various Readings, amounting in the whole to above 2000, and many of them of great consequence, collected from Mss. printed editions, copies of the Talmud, and the works of the most renowned Rabbies. And in one of the notes is this remark:—"That in several "passages of the Hebrew Bible the differences are so

"Basil, anno 1537, was published (*typis* HENRICI PETRI) "a small folio, containing a pretended antient Gospel of *St.* "*Matthew* in Hebrew, together with a Latin Translation, "and Annotations by the Editor SEBASTIANUS MUN-"STERUS; the same who, anno 1535, had published an "Hebrew Bible, with a new Latin Translation of his own, "and Annotations, at Basil, in two volumes in folio: which "were reprinted at Basil with considerable improvements, "anno 1546. Of this I have a fine copy." C. D. M.

"many

"many and ſo great, that they know not which to fix "upon as the true Readings [g]."

We cannot quit this ſubject without obſerving, on Dr. KENNICOTT's authority, that as the firſt printed Bibles are more correct than the later ones; ſo the Variations between the firſt edition, printed in 1488, and the edition of VANDER HOOGHT, in 1705, at Amſterdam, in 2 vols. 8vo. amount, upon the whole, to above TWELVE THOUSAND! [b]

But theſe are not the only Variations that we are concerned to take notice of. Parallel places of Scripture, though evidently derived from the ſame original, are found to differ in no ſmall degree. Of this many ſtriking inſtances have been long ſince given by Dr. KENNICOTT, in his *State of the printed Hebrew Text*, Diſſ. I. And we are enabled, by the kindneſs of a valuable Friend, to lay before the Reader another ſpecimen of the ſame kind [i], in a Collation of the accounts of the Dedication of the Temple, as written 1 Kings vii. 51. viii. 1, &c. and 2 Chron. v. 1, &c.

[g] Dr. KENNICOTT's Plan, Dec. 16, 1772.

[b] Annual Accounts, p. 130.

[i] This ſpecimen occaſioned the publication of a very uſeful treatiſe, by the ſame Author, under the title of "Critica "Sacra, or a ſhort Introduction to Hebrew Criticiſm;" which was followed by "A Supplement," in anſwer to the pamphlet of Mr. RAPHAEL BARUH, a learned Jew, intituled, "Critica Sacra examined, &c." N.

A COLLATION

OF THE ACCOUNT OF

The DEDICATION of the TEMPLE.

1 Kings vii.	2 Chron. v.
VARIOUS READINGS.	
Ver. 51. המלך	Ver. 1. wanting.
בית falsely for	לבית
דוד	דויד
את הכסף	ואת הכסף wrong.
ואת הכלים	ואת כל הכלים
יהוה	האלהים
viii. 1. יקהל	2. יקהיל
המלך שלמה redundant.	wanting
דוד	דויד
2. שלמה	3. wanting.
בירח האתנים	improperly omitted.
3. הכהנים	4. הלוים
4. את ארון יהוה	את הארון without יהוה
ויעלו	העלו
והלוים rightly.	הלוים
5. אתו redundant.	6. wanting.
6. ויבאו	7. ויביאו
הכרובים	הכדבים
7. כי	8. ויהיו
אל	על
ויסכו lit. transpositis.	ויכסו
הכרבים	הכרובים
8. ויארכו	9. ויאריכו
הקדש	הארון
ויהיו rightly.	ויהי
9. לחות האבנים	10. הלחות without האבנים

* N. B. ברית seems to be wanting in both places after כרת.

1 Kings viii.	2 Chron. v. and vi.
VARIOUS READINGS.	
9. הנח	10. נתן
שם rightly	negligently omitted.
מארץ מצרים	ממצרים
10. והענן מלא את בית יהוה	13. והבית מלא ענן * בית יהוה
11. את בית יהוה	14. את בית האלהים
13. בנה	vi. 2. ואני
מכון	ומכון
14. עמד	3. עומד
15. דוד	4. דויד
ובידו	ובידיו
16. את ישראל	5. wanting.
ממצרים	מארץ מצרים
N. B. The opposite 13 words, though necessary to complete the sense, are omitted in Kings, owing to the similar endings of two sentences, one of which the transcriber negligently overlooked.	ולא בחרתי באיש להיות נגיד על עמי ישראל: ואבחר בירושלם להיות שמי שם
16. בדוד	6. בדויד
17. דוד	7. דויד
18. דוד	8. דויד
הטיבת	הטיבות
19. כי אם	9. כי without אם
20. ואקם	10. ואקום
דוד	דויד
21. ואשם	11. ואשים
מהם לארון	את־הארון
אבתינו	בנו ישראל
בהוציאו אתם מארץ מצרים	wanting.

* For בבה the LXX read בבור. The text is evidently wrong: and ought to stand as in 1 Kings.

1 Kings viii.	2 Chron. vi.
Various Readings.	
℣ 22. שלמה	℣ 12. wanting.
השמים	13. * השמימה
23. אלהים	14. האלהים
ממעל	wanting.
וגל הארץ	ובארץ
מתחת	wanting.
24. דוד	15. דויד
25. דוד	16. דויד
ישב	יושב
לפני	בתורתי
26. אלהי	17. יהיה אלהי
נא	wanting.
דבריך wrong.	דברך right.
דוד אבי	לדויד
27. wanting.	18. את האדם
השמים	שמים
יכלכלך	יכלכלוך
28. היום	19. wanting.
29. עינך	20. עיניך
פתחת	פתוחות
לילה ויום	יומם ולילה
יהיה שמי	לשום שמך
לשמע	לשמוע
30. תחנת	21. תחניני
אל מקום	ממקום
אל השמים	מן השמים
31. את אשר	22. אם
32. השמים	23. מן השמים
להרשיע רשע	להשיב לרשע
33. בהנגף	24. ואם ינגף
אשר	כי

* Verse 13th is a parenthesis (not extant in Kings) with part of verse 12th repeated.

1 Kings viii.	2 Chron. vi.
VARIOUS READING.	
℣ 33. אליך	℣ 24. wanting.
אליך	לפניך
34. השמים	25. מן השמים
והשבתם	והשיבותם
נתת לאבותם	נתתה להם ולאבתיהם
35. שמים	26. השמים
ומחטאתם	מחטאתם
36. את הדרך	27. אל הדרך
37. ירקון	28. וירקון right.
איבו	איביו wrong.
כל מחלה	וכל מחלה right.
38. תהיה	29. יהיה
לכל עמך	ולכל עמך
ידעון	ידעו
נגע לבבו	נגעו ומכאבו
39. השמים	30. מן השמים
ועשית	wanting.
ונתת	ונתתה
ידעת לבדך	לבדך ידעת
כל בני	כל בני without
40. יראוך	31. יראוך
wanting.	ללכת בדרכיך
42. כי ישמעון את שמך	32. wanting.
ואת ידך	וידך
וזרעך	וזרועך
ובא	ובאו
והתפלל	והתפללו
43. אתה	33. ואתה
השמים	מן השמים
מכום	ממכום
ידעון	ידעו
ליראה	וליראה
44. איבו	34. איביו

1 Kings viii.	2 Chron. vi.
VARIOUS READINGS.	
✝ 44. אל יהוה	✝ 34. אליך
wanting.	הזאת
בנתי	בניתי
45. השמים	35. מן השמים
46. שביהם	36. שוביהם
האויב	wanting.
47. אל לבם	37. אל לבבם
שביהם	שבים
והעוינו	העוינו right.
רשענו	ורשעינו right.
48. לבבם	38. לבם
איביהם	שבים
אליך	wanting.
העיך	והעיר
והבית	ולבית
בנית	בניתי right.
49. השמים	39. מן השמים
מכון	ממכון
תחנתם	תחנתיהם

N. B. This Collation, made from WALTON's *Polyglott*, proceeds no farther, because the remainder of SOLOMON's Prayer is very different in *Kings*, from what it is in *Chronicles*; for which difference if the Learned could clearly account, it would be of great service to this important branch of Literature.

In

In Mr. CLARKE's *Connexion of the Roman, Saxon, and English Coins*, among many other interesting particulars, is a curious Dissertation on the *Jewish Money*; in which the *Shekel*, as determined by GRSEPSIUS *, is proved (against the united authority of VILLALPANDUS and GREAVES) to have been synonymous to the *Didrachma*, or forty-eighth part of a pound: and consequently a fourth part of an ounce; not half an ounce, as has been commonly supposed.

* "It is now almost two centuries since STANISLAUS GRSEPSIUS, a learned Polander, published a treatise, *De multiplici siclo, et talento Hebraico*. This book met with a very singular fate. It was at first much neglected; and then, about a century afterwards, published in Germany, as a very choice Ms. found in one of their libraries. One HENRICUS GOUTIER THULEMARIUS re-printed it word for word, without taking the least notice of its author; and this Literary Pirate was in time regarded as the true Proprietor. See BAUDELOT, Utilité des Voyages, vol. II. p. 247. and FABRICIUS, Bibl. Ant. p. 27." Mr. CLARKE, p. 242.—This learned work of GRSEPSIUS would be no temptation to a Literary Pirate of these days! B.

N° III.

N° III.

On the first-printed POLYGLOTTS.

THE first POLYGLOTT work was printed at Genoa in 1516, by PETER PAUL PORRUS [a], who undertook to print the Pentaglott Psalter of AUGUSTIN JUSTINIAN, bishop of Nebo. It was in Hebrew, Arabic [b], Chaldaic, and Greek, with the Latin Versions,

[a] "By PORRUS it was *printed* at Genoa, *in ædibus* "*Nicolai* JUSTINIANI *Pauli*; whither he seems to have been "invited for that purpose: after which I conceive that he "returned to his usual place of abode at Turin; as by him-"self, at the end of the book, he is called *Petrus Porrus* "*Mediolanensis* TAURINI DEGENS." C. D. M. Mr. DE MISSY had three copies of this Psalter, of which the finest was sold to Mr. CRACHERODE for one guinea.

[b] The Arabic version is of no authority, as it was translated, not from the Hebrew, but from the Septuagint; where the version of the Prophets (particularly *Jeremiah*) is less faithful than that of the other books of the Old Testament, and was probably made by a Jew who was very ignorant of Hebrew. But this is far from being the case of the Pentateuch. See MICHAELIS, *Syntagma Commentationum*, 1763, Comm. III. p. 58. and PRIDEAUX, vol. II. folio, p. 36. The Illyrian, Gothic, Arabic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Syriac versions were all made from the Septuagint; though there is still in being an older version of the Syriac, translated immediatedly from the Hebrew original. PRIDEAUX, p. 37.

"The Arabic is the *latest* of all the antient versions of "the Old Testament.—In the year 942 died R. SAADIAS,

Versions, Glosses, and Scholia, which last made the eighth column, in *folio*. The *Arabic* was the first that ever was printed; and this the first piece of the Bible that ever appeared in so many languages [*b*].

"called *Gaon* (i. e. *the illustrious*), who presided over the "Babylonian schools.—The chief merit of this learned and "laborious Rabbi is, that he translated all the Old Testa-"ment from the Hebrew into Arabic; expressing the Ara-"bic in Hebrew characters. But though the whole Hebrew "Bible was thus translated by him; yet *the Pentateuch* "only has been, as yet, published from his version. The "other books, now in Arabic, in the Paris and London "Polyglotts, were translated at different times, by different "authors; partly from the Greek, and partly from the "Syriac versions: and but few parts, if any, (excepting "the Pentateuch) were translated from the Hebrew." Dr. KENNICOTT, on the State of the printed Hebrew Text, Diss. II. p. 452—454.

See a particular enumeration of the Arabic versions, both Ms. and printed, in LE LONG, p. 214, &c. N.

[*b*] JUSTINIAN, presuming this work would procure him great gain, as well as reputation, caused 2000 copies to be printed of it, and promised in his Preface to proceed with the other parts of the Bible. But he was miserably disappointed: every one applauded the work; but few proceeded further; and scarce a fourth part of his number was sold. Besides the 2000 copies, he had also printed fifty upon vellum, which he presented to every crowned head, whether Christian or Infidel. The whole New Testament was prepared for the press by JUSTINIAN, who had also made great progress in the Old. See LE LONG, Bibliotheca Sacra, p. 2. MAITTAIRE, Annal. Typ. tom. II. Par. I. p. 121. PALMER, Hist. of Printing, p. 263. N.

In

In 1518, JOHN POTKEN published the Psalter, in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Æthiopic, [or Chaldaic, as he, with some others, called it,] at Cologn; but the name of the Printer is no where to be found throughout the book [c]. It has no Preface properly so called:

[c] The *Printer's* name is no where mentioned, that we know of, except in the following observations of the late Mr. DE MISSY, to whom this article had been communicated: 'I would almost venture to affirm, that *you* have 'named him when you named *Potken*. For if he does not 'say expressly that *he* was the Printer, he seems at least to 'give us a broad hint of it, when he says: *Statui jam 'senex linguas externas aliquas discere: & per artem impressoriam, quam adolescens* didici, *edere: ut modico ære libri in 'diversis linguis, formis æneis excusi emi possint.* These words 'might have been minded, but were omitted, by *Le Long* 'in the abstracts he made of Potken's address to his 'readers at the end of the book. Towards the end of the 'same Address he says *imprimi curavi:* but such a phrase 'may very well be understood of one who saw his work 'printed at home with his own types. And, besides, he 'might have chosen that phrase as the most convenient, on 'account of his having been absent for some time while 'the impression was carried on by his kinsman and learned 'assistant *Seter*, alias *Heyl*. Confer with the above Address 'what he says, p. 7. (col. 2 *sub finem*) of his *Introductiuncula*, &c. a small work of no more than four leaves, 'which was certainly intended to go along with the Psalter, 'though it is not always, and is perhaps very seldom, to be 'found with it. In the abovementioned Address he pretends to be the first who had *imported into Europe* what he 'calls *the Chaldee* [now more properly called the *Æthiopic*]

called: but from an Addreſs of POTKEN to the ſtudious Readers, which is printed on the laſt page of the Pſalter,

'*Tongue*. And nothing hitherto has appeared to the contrary. Some quibblers indeed might object, that it rather was imported by the Æthiopian Fryars who had helped him to learn it. But he certainly ſeems to have been the firſt who preſented the European Republic of Letters with a printed *Introductiuncula* to the Reading of that language: nor could any body, that I know of, have ſaid in 1518, that in 1513 he had publiſhed or printed an Æthiopic book in Europe, as Potken does in his Addreſs of 1518, where he acquaints us, that, nearly five years before, he had given at Rome an edition of the Æthiopic Pſalter printed by itſelf: for it is evidently of ſuch a Pſalter that he ſays: *Pſalterium ..... arte impreſſoria ..... quinquennio vix exacto, Romæ edidi:* which book is noticed by *Le Long*, in theſe words: *Pſalmi & Canticum Canticorum Æthiopice ſtudio Joannis Potken cum ejus præfatione Latina, in* 4°. Romæ 1513. That *Latin Preface*, could I get a ſight of it, would perhaps enable me to be more particular and more poſitive. The book is marked by Le Long himſelf as being in the Royal Library at Paris; and an account of the ſaid Preface, no-doubt, might eaſily be obtained, if aſking for it ſhould become a matter of any importance to the curious. Thus much, however, I thought, might be propoſed proviſionally, concerning the name of the Printer to whom the world was indebted for Potken's Polyglott Pſalter.——But ſince I have dwelt ſo long upon that ſubject, I cannot well diſmiſs it without adding a word about the rank which Le Long gives to this work among the firſt-printed Polyglott Pſalters; immediately after that of *Juſtiniani*, printed by *Porrus* in 1516; and before another, by him ſuppoſed to be printed,

as

Psalter, we are informed, that, while his earnest zeal for Christianity, and for the Roman See, made him extremely

' as well as Potken's, two years later. *Psalterium Hebraice,* ' *Græce, & Latine, cura & studio Desid. Erasmi.* V. *S. Hiero-* ' *nymi Opera, in fol. Basileæ, typis Amerbachii* 1518. Such ' was Le Long's indication of the book in the first edition of ' his *Bibliotheca Sacra.* In the last Paris edition (1723) it ' runs thus: " Psalterium Hebraice, & Latine, tam ex Ver- " sione S. Hieronymi secundum Hebraicam veritatem quam " ex Vulgata Latina, cura & studio Desid. Erasmi & Conr. " Pellicani. V. *S. Hieronymi Opera,* in fol. Basileæ, typis " Amerbachii 1518," and is followed by these scraps *Ex* ' *præfatione Brunonis Amerbachii.* " Veteri probatæque " Theologiæ plurimum lucis accessurum ex hac castissima " [*it should have been* castigatissima] Hieronymianorum ope- " rum editione, quam in primis Erasmo, nonnihil etiam no- " bis studiosi ferre debent acceptum [*for* acceptam] . . . Nos " huic octavo tomo corrollarii vice quadruplex Psalterium " adjecimus, videlicet & Hebraicum, & huic oppositam D. " [*divi*] Hieronymi versionem, quam vulgo Hebræam ve- " ritatem appellant, Græcum item, cui respondet e regione " tralatio quæ passim legitur, ἀδηλῶς, hoc est incerto auctore " [*autore incerto*] . . . & in Hebraicis præcipue curavimus, " ut quam minimum ab archetypis & his antiquissimis dis- " cederemus . . . . . Porro fatemur ingenue hoc negotii " ἐκ ἀνευθησέως, [ἐκ ἄνευ θησέως,] quod aiunt, nos confecisse, " sed adjutus [*adjutos*] opera doctissimi pariter & humanissimi " Patris Conradi [*Chonradi*] Pellicani Rubeaquensis, ex " familia D. [*divi*] Francisci cujus auspicio potissimum hæc " res peracta est." What shall we say to all this? I have ' certainly strong reasons to question whether Le Long ever

extremely desirous of learning foreign languages, especially what he calls the Chaldee, for which he was

'saw an edition of what is commonly called *Erasmus's St. Jerom*, bearing the date of 1518: except some copy or 'copies of the first edition should be supposed to have been 'sold with a new title bearing such a date. But even this 'I have strong reasons to disbelieve. The most, in short, 'I can grant is, that considering the more general use, and 'of course the more general demand, of the eighth vo-'lume, or even of the very separable part of it which con-'tains the Polyglott Psalter; some copies of either may 'have been sold singly with any fresher title and date, in 'order to please that very common sort of buyers who will 'by all means be served with the newest edition. A copy 'of the intire eighth volume I can shew, the date of which, 'in the title-page, is so late as 1527. But then, on the very 'back of that title page, is printed a short Preface by 'Bruno Amerbachius, the original date of which is thus pre-'served: *Idibus Januariis. Anno M.D.XVI*; and in which he 'declares that a peculiar Preface shall be given to the Poly-'glott Psalter. Now this peculiar Preface is certainly the 'same from which the above abstracts have been taken by 'Le Long; and, being likewise printed on the back of the 'Psalter's title-page, preserves also the original date of 'the said year 1516: from which circumstances, without 'descending to more minute particulars, it is plain, I think, 'that this Psalter, being two years more antient than Por-'ken's, ought to have been placed before it. Nay, I would 'fain ask, if it might not dispute the precedency even with 'Porrus's? And this at least I can affirm, that Porrus's 'date is *Mense* VIIIIbri, and Amerbach's VIII *Calend. Sep-*

 'tembreis,

was destitute of any proper master; some Æthiopian Fryars happened to be at Rome (as he expresses it), *pere-*

'*tembreis*. Neither could it well be urged as a decisive 'point in favour of Porrus's, that its date is at the end of 'the work, while Amerbach's is only at the end of a Pre-'face, on the very back of the title-page, which apparently 'was printed the first of all, and that the time required to 'print the rest might retard the dispatch of the whole book 'beyond the month of November. For, not to mention 'the Printer's well-known and almost prodigious diligence, 'who, by taking proper measures before-hand, and setting 'several presses at work for the same book, might have done 'with it before the last-mentioned month; it will be suffi-'cient to observe, *in the first place*, That the first sheet of 'the first *Quaternio*, though ready for the press, may have 'been purposely left with a blank page (either worked-off 'or not), until the blank page could be filled up with a 'Preface, in which the Editors, conformably to reason, might 'speak of their performance as of a work already executed. '—*Secondly*, That, without going a great way for an actual 'example of what I suppose *may* have been practised in this 'case, a shining example of it we have at hand in the very 'next ninth and last volume; the final date of which specify-'ing the month of *May* 1516, the Preface nevertheless is 'dated *June* the 26 (*Sexto Kalendas Julias*).—*Thirdly*, That, 'of all the dates in the whole set which mark the month, the 'oldest being (T. II. fol. verso 191) of August 1515, none 'is so late in 1516 as that of the Polyglott Psalter in question. 'From which reasons it is plain to me that the book might 'have been ready for sale, if not precisely on the 25th of 'August (VIII *Calend. Septembreis*) at farthest a few days 'after; two months, not to say three, before Porrus had 'printed

peregrinationis causa, to whom he eagerly applied: and that, from his intercourse with them, he had acquired

'printed his final date of *November*, without marking the 'day; which, if one of the last in the month, he had some 'reason to suppress, that it might not look near four full 'months remote from the first of August; this being the 'date of Justiniani's dedication to the Pope, and the dedi-'cation having probably been printed when he hoped, and 'perhaps promised, that against such a time the whole should 'be finished. But, be this as it will, I think I have said 'enough to make good what I hinted above, that the Poly-'glott Psalter of Basil might dispute the precedency with that 'of Genoa.—By all this, however, I am far from pretend-'ing to make *Erasmus* the first Editor of Polyglott Books; 'and I firmly believe that when Le Long inserted these 'words, *Cura & studio Desid. Erasmi*, he did it without any 'other foundation than the common opinion which ascribes 'to *Erasmus* the whole business of preparing this Edition of 'Jerom's works; though he so little meddled with Hebrew, 'that when he had occasion for it, *en passant*, he would not 'proceed without requiring the assistance of the two brothers '*Bruno* and *Basil Amerbach*. So that Le Long, instead of '*Cura & studio Desid. Erasmi*, might rather have said, *Cura* '*& studio Brunonis & Basilii Amerbachiorum* (or, as they used 'to spell it, *Amorbachiorum*). This I infer from their joint 'Address to the Reader, at the head of Tome the Fifth; 'where also the Reader is informed of some particulars 'which may serve as a good, or even necessary, comment 'upon the fifth page of Erasmus's dedication to Archbishop 'Warham. I. That when Erasmus [who by the bye had 'himself collected materials towards an edition by him 'intended

acquired ſuch a knowledge of their language, as to make him believe he might undertake an edition of the

'intended of St. Jerom's works] came to Baſil; he found 'great proviſions and preparations already made [for the 'ſame purpoſe], at the expence, and by the care, of their 'now deceaſed Father, *John Amerbach:* who, after procuring 'St. Ambroſe's and St. Auſtin's works, printed *ſuis typis*, 'had reſolved to go on with St. Jerom's. II. That their 'father, intending to make them collaborators in that work, 'had furniſhed them with ſome knowledge (*qualicunque* '*peritia*, as they term it) in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew 'languages. III. That Eraſmus having taken upon him 'the care of the four firſt Tomes, the care of the five laſt 'became their lot. And accordingly, in all the ſubſequent 'Addreſſes to the Reader, we find them (though under the 'ſole name of *Bruno*) ſpeaking as Editors; yet making ho-'nourable mention of the Learned to whoſe aſſiſtance they 'acknowledged themſelves much indebted. And let me add, 'that they not only never ſpeak as Printers, but expreſs 'themſelves in ſuch a manner as to leave all the honours of 'the printing-office to *John Froben:* ſo that, in Le Long's 'account, it was a new miſtake to write *Typis Amerbachii:* a 'miſtake, however, which Maittaire himſelf, in *his* account, 'has not avoided, his words being, p. 124: *Eodem anno quo* 'Vol. II. '*Juſtinianus ſuum Pſalterium Pentaglotton edidit*; *Baſileæ ab* '*Amorbachio Pſalterium triglotton . . . excuſum eſt.*—Some-'thing more might be added in order to rectify, by the pre-'ſent account of Eraſmus's Jerom, ſome inaccuracies which 'may puzzle or miſlead the reader, in the accounts given 'of it by the very beſt and lateſt writers of Eraſmus's Life: 'but I think that this hint alone may be ſufficient. The

'only

the Æthiopic Psalter; which was actually published at Rome nearly five years before the date of his Polyglott performance. At the end of the above-mentioned address, he promised to perform something in the Arabic, if he should meet with sufficient encouragement.

The famous Bible of Cardinal XIMENES, commonly called the *Complutensian*, consists of six large folio volumes; having the Hebrew [d], Latin, and Greek, in

'only addition in which I shall indulge myself, will be to 'present the Reader with a kind of Inscription in capitals, 'which is very conspicuous at the end of the last volume; 'and by which we may be made, in some measure, to understand, not only how far Froben is to be looked upon 'as connected with, or distinguished from, the Amerbachs; 'but also, what that *Society* was, which I remember is somewhere spoken of by Erasmus himself (if I mistake not), 'who relates, that on his refusing with some obstinacy a 'considerable sum offered him by Froben, and urging that 'he thought such a sum too considerable from a man even 'in his circumstances, Froben at last prevailed by assuring 'him, that the offer he made was not at his own private 'expence, but at the expence of the *Society*. The said 'Inscription is as follows: "BASILEAE IN AEDIBVS IO. "FROBENNII IMPENDIO BRVNONIS, BASILII ET BONIFACII "AMORBACHIORVM, AC IOANNIS FROBENNII CHALCO-"GRAPHI ET IACOBI RECHBVRGII CIVIVM BASILIENSIVM. "MENSE MAIO. AN. M.D XVI." C. D. M.—Mr. DE MISSY had two copies of POTKEN's *Psalter*, the best of which was sold for no more than 18 shillings. N.

[d] The Hebrew text in this edition was corrected by ALPHONSUS,

in three diſtinct columns, and the Chaldee paraphraſe, with a Latin interpretation, at the bottom of the page, the margin being filled with the Hebrew and Chaldee radicals. It was begun in 1502, finiſhed in 1517, but not publiſhed till 1522. A more particular account of it may be ſeen in LE LONG, in MAITTAIRE, and in DE BURE [e].

In 1546 appeared, at Conſtantinople, "Pentateuchus Hebræo-Chaldæo-Perſico-Arabicus," in three columns; the Hebrew text in the middle; on the right hand the Perſic verſion of R. JACOB fil. JOSEPH; and on the left the Chaldee paraphraſe of ONKELOS: at the top is the Arabic paraphraſe of SAADIAS, and at the bottom the commentary of RASI. The whole is printed in Hebrew characters with points, the middle column on a larger ſize than the

ALPHONSUS, a phyſician of Complutum, PAULUS CORONELLUS, and ALPHONSUS ZAMORA, who were all converts from Judaiſm to Chriſtianity. The manuſcripts it was printed from had undergone the Maſoretical caſtigation. See Dr. KENNICOTT, Diſſ. II. p. 475. N.

[e] In the firſt edition of this little tract, we gave our readers reaſon to hope for ſome further remarks on the COMPLUTENSIAN Bible, and on the edition of PLANTINUS. If the life of our valuable Friend had been prolonged, that hope would not have been diſappointed. With his uſual alacrity and benevolence, he had actually collected many materials, and begun to methodize his thoughts on the ſubject: what was done, Mrs. DE MISSY has kindly permitted us to annex to the preſent publication; and, though in an unfiniſhed ſtate, will be deemed an acquiſition to polite letters. B. & N.

others. At the end of Genesis appears, "Absolutus "est liber Geneseos in domo ELIEZERIS BERAB "GERSON Soncinatis [f]."

In 1547, was published, from the same press, "Pen-"tateuchus Hebraicus, Hispanicus, & Barbaro-Græ-"cus." This edition was also printed in three columns; the Hebrew Text in the middle; the old Spanish version on the right hand; and on the left, the *modern* Greek, as used by the Caraïtes at Constantinople, who do not understand Hebrew. The Spanish is designed for the Refugee Spanish Jews. At the head and bottom of the pages are the Targum and the Commentary, as in the former editions [g].

The *Royal* or *Spanish* Polyglott was printed at Antwerp, by CHRISTOPHER PLANTINUS, 1569—1572, by authority of Philip II, King of Spain, in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Chaldee, under the direction of ARIAS MONTANUS, in eight volumes, folio; containing, besides the whole of the Complutensian edition, a Chaldee paraphrase on part of the Old Testament, which Cardinal XIMENES had deposited in the theological library at Complutum, having particular reasons for not publishing it. The New Testament had the Syriac version, and the Latin translation of SANTES PAGNINUS as reformed by ARIAS MONTANUS [h]. This work was also enriched with

[f] LE LONG, p. 45. [g] Ibid. p. 46.

[h] "We need say the less of this great work; as it is "not pretended, that the least *correction* was made in this "edition of the Hebrew Text. Indeed no such thing could "possibly

with various Grammars and Dictionaries of the several languages it consists of.

In 1586 a Polyglott Bible was published at Heidelberg, in two volumes, folio; printed in four columns, Hebrew, Greek, and two Latin versions, viz. St. JEROM's and that of PAGNINUS; with the notes of VATABLUS; and in the margin are the idioms, and the *radices* of all the difficult words. Two other dates have been seen to this edition, viz. 1599 and 1616; but LE LONG, after an attentive comparison, declares them to be only different copies of the same impression; but that some them have the Greek Testament with the addition of the Latin version of ARIAS MONTANUS [*i*].

"possibly be expected from an Editor who believed the "perfection of the Hebrew Text—*quanta integritate* (says "he) *semper conservata fuerint Biblia Hebræa, plerique doc-* "*tissimi viri constanter asseverarunt*, &c. HODY, p. 516, "517." Dr. KENNICOTT, Diss. II. p. 477. This edition (which is particularly mentioned in LE LONG, p. 20.) is described by M. DE BURE as a work most beautifully printed; but, on account of the great number of treatises it contains, it is difficult to arrange the volumes properly. Mr. DE MISSY, from whom I flattered myself I should have received an accurate relation of this edition, had a good copy of it; which happening to be but in indifferent binding, was sold for no more than seven pounds, to Mr. MAC CARTHY, who purchased many other articles, and particularly many little French curiosities. N.

[*i*] "Quæ sub VATABLI nomine circumferuntur Biblia, "ejus non sunt; annotationesque eidem adscriptæ auctorem "habent ROBERTUM STEPHANUM." WALTON, Proleg. iv. p. 33. See LE LONG, p. 15.

In

In 1596, JACOBUS LUCIUS printed an edition, in Greek, Latin, and German, at Hamburgh, in four volumes, folio, "Studio DAVIDIS WOLDERI;" the Greek from the Venice edition of 1518 [k]; the Latin verſions thoſe of St. JEROM and PAGNINUS.

In 1599, ELIAS HUTTERUS publiſhed one at Noremberg, in ſix languages; four of them, the Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek, and Latin, printed from the Antwerp edition; the fifth was the German verſion of

[k] LE LONG, p. 26.—FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ſays the ſame. But the editor, WOLDERUS himſelf, in his Preface, ſpeaks thus: "De LXX interpretum Græcâ, deque "Latinâ HIERONYMI, ut putatur, verſione nihil moneo: "niſi quod ſcire tua non parum, opinor, intereſt; in iis, "Plantinianam editionem me eſſe ſequutum: quod cor-"rectior quidem quæ eſſet nulla ſeſe mihi offerret." As far as can be judged from a collation of ſome paſſages, it appears that he followed the edition of PLANTINUS, but uſed his own judgement in the punctuation and other leſs material particulars. The new Latin verſion, here printed, appears to be, not that of PAGNINUS (though ſaid to be his by WOLDERUS); but rather that which ROBERT STEPHENS publiſhed in 1557, corrected from the obſervations of PAGNINUS and VATABLUS. The New Teſtament is the firſt of BEZA, which R. STEPHENS printed in 1556, with the ſame types which he uſed in the following year for the abovementioned Latin verſion of the Old Teſtament.—We are indebted for this note to the Mſ. annotations which Mr. DE MISSY had made many years ago on the margin of his copy of LE LONG's *Bibliotheca Sacra*, ſuch as it is in the Leipſic edition of 1709.—Mr. DE MISSY's copy of WOLDERUS was ſold for half a guinea, and is now in THE ROYAL LIBRARY. N.

LUTHER;

LUTHER; and the sixth the Sclavonic version of Wittemberg [l]. This Bible was never completed, and goes no farther than the book of *Ruth*.

The next work of this kind was, "Biblia Sacra "Polyglotta, studio GUY MICHAELIS LE JAY. Pa-"risiis, apud Antonium Vitray, 1628, & ann. seqq. "ad 1645," in ten volumes, very large folio. This edition, which is extremely magnificent [m], contains all that is in those of XIMENES and PLANTINUS, with the addition of the Syriac and Arabic version.

This was soon followed by "Biblia Sacra Poly-"glotta, complectentia textus originales, Hebraïc. "Chaldaïc. & Græc. Pentateuchum Samaritanum, "& Versiones Antiquas, cum apparatu, appendi-

[l] Instead of the Sclavonic, some copies were printed with the French version of Geneva; others, with the Italian of the same city; and others again with a Saxon version from the German of LUTHER.—HUTTERUS published the Psalter and New Testament in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and German. He also published the New Testament in TWELVE languages; viz. Syriac, Hebrew, Greek, Italian, Spanish, and French, in one page; and Latin, German, Bohemian, English, Danish, and Polonese, in another. CALMET, ubi supra. See LE LONG, p. 26.—In Mr. DE MISSY's catalogue appeared, "Hutteri Biblia Polyglotta, & Nov. Test. "vol. 2." The *two* volumes were sold to THE BRITISH MUSEUM, for half a guinea. N.

[m] The Samaritan Pentateuch was first printed in it, with its version, from MSS. brought into Europe between the year 1620 and 1630, under the care of the very learned MORINUS. See Dr. KENNICOTT, Diss. II. p. 478. N.

"cibus & annotationibus; studio & opera BRIANI "WALTON. Londini 1657, & ann. seqq." [z] in four

[z] *Nine* languages are used in this edition; yet there is no *one* book in the whole Bible printed in so many. In the New Testament the Four Evangelists are in *six* languages; the other books only in *five*; those of Judith and the Maccabees only in *three*. The Septuagint version is printed from the edition at Rome, anno 1587. The Latin is the Vulgate of CLEMENT VIII. The Chaldee Paraphrase is completer than any former publication. The edition is enriched with Prefaces, Prolegomena, Treatises on Weights and Measures, Geographical Charts, and Chronological Tables. CALMET, ubi supra, p. viii.—Dr. WALTON was assisted in this laborious undertaking by Dr. EDMUND CASTELL, who translated from the Syriac some fragments of Daniel, the books of Tobit and Judith, the Letters of Jeremiah and Baruch, and the first book of the Maccabees; he also translated the Song of Solomon from the Æthiopic into Latin, and added notes to the Samaritan Pentateuch; but the most considerable assistance he gave was by his Lexicon in two volumes, a work which is a necessary supplement to the Polyglott.—ALEXANDER HUISSE *collected* the *various Readings* at the bottom of each page; revised the Septuagint version, the Greek Text of the New Testament, and the Latin Vulgate; he also collated the edition of the Old Testament printed at Rome, and the New Testament of ROBERT STEPHENS, with the Alexandrine manuscript. See PRIDEAUX, vol. II. p. 47. Dr. THOMAS HYDE corrected the Arabic, Syriac, and Persic; as LOFTUSIUS did the Æthiopic version of the New Testament. LOUIS LE DIEU and SAMUEL CLARKE were also assistants

four volumes [o]. To which was added, "Lexicon "Heptaglotton, Hebraïcum, Chaldaïcum, Syriacum, "Samaritanum, Æthiopicum, Arabicum, & Persi- "cum, digestum & evulgatum ab Edmundo Cas- "tello [p], 1686," in two volumes more. This may properly be called a new edition of LE JAY, with improvements; no pains having been spared in making it as perfect as possible: the whole was revised with

assistants in the work. LE LONG, p. 33, &c.—"The im- "mense merit of this work is too well known to need any "laboured recommendation. And yet, it must be observed, "that in *This*, the best and most useful of all editions, the "Hebrew Text is printed *Masoretically*; almost in an ab- "solute agreement with the many former editions, and with "the latest and worst Mss." KENNICOTT, Diss. II. p. 480. N.

[o] This Polyglott was published by subscription, and was the first book that was ever printed in that manner in England. BLOME, a notorious plagiary, afterwards carried the practice of publishing books by subscription to a greater height than any of his contemporaries.—In the "Collectanea "Ecclesiastica" of Sam. Brewster Esq. Lond. 1752, 4to. is an English treatise by Bp. WALTON, called, "A Treatise "concerning the Payment of Tyths in London." In the Life of Dr. Edward Brook, prefixed to his "Theological "Works," are some curious particulars relating to the London Polyglott. See GRANGER, vol. II. p. 19. Towards the printing of the work, Dr. WALTON had contributions of money from many noble persons, which were put into the hands of Sir William Humble, treasurer for the work. N.

[p] See p. 134. Some account of Dr. CASTELL will be given at the end of this pamphlet.

great

great care, and accurately corrected; and it is justly considered as the most useful of all the Polyglotts, though LE JAY's is the handsomest. Dr. WALTON's edition was supposed by Mr. PALMER to have been printed from sheets surreptitiously obtained from the press at Paris; and to have been published with improvements so soon after, as to reduce M. LE JAY almost to want, after having expended above £. 5000 sterling to compleat his work [q]. But Mr. PALMER mistook the date of LE JAY's *Polyglott* (which he makes to be 1657), and then formed his conclusion of the sheets being sent into England from Paris; and met with a correspondent, it seems, that encouraged his error. LE JAY's *Polyglott* was published, in Ten Volumes, MDCXLV: The English *Polyglott*, in Six Volumes, not till MDCLVII, twelve years after the other [r]. Under a fine head of Dr. WALTON,

[q] It appears by M. DE BURE's account, that LE JAY declined an offer, which had been made him, of supplying England with a number of copies at a reasonable price; and was afterwards obliged to sell a great part of his impression for waste paper. N.

[r] Dr. WALTON got leave to import paper, duty-free, in 1652; began the work 1653; and published it 1657. It is surprizing he could get through six such volumes in four years; though certainly many Printers were employed on it; among others, Mr. ICABOD DAWKS * of Lowlayton, maternal grandfather to W. BOWYER. But it is plain that, in the re-printed leaf of the Preface, Dr. WALTON

* Of whose son, see The Tatler, N° 178.

robs

TON, engraved by LOMBART, and prefixed to his edition of the Polyglott, we are told it was begun only in MDCLIII.—It is said indeed that the English put out *Proposals* for a cheaper and better edition, soon after LE JAY's was published, which might in some measure hinder the sale of it. But other causes concurred. The enormous size of the book rendered it inconvenient for use; and the price deterred purchasers. And further, the refusal of LE JAY to publish it under RICHELIEU's name, though that Minister, after the example of Cardinal XIMENES, had offered to print it at his own expence, damped the sale.—The English Polyglott, in return, made but little way in France. A *large-paper* [s] copy was sold, in 1728, in the library of COLBERT, the six volumes bound in fourteen. CASTELL's *Lexicon*,

robs the Protector of the honour of patronizing this work, which was begun in 1653, and published in 1657; three years before the Restoration, 1660. The license was granted by the Council of State in 1652; and was continued by OLIVER, who dissolved the Rump Parliament in 1653. After the Restoration, Dr. WALTON had the honour of presenting his Bible to king CHARLES II, who made him his chaplain in ordinary, and soon after promoted him to the bishoprick of Chester. He was consecrated Dec. 2, 1660; and died Nov. 29, 1661.

[s] M DE BURE says, there is a tradition that *no more than twelve copies* of WALTON's Polyglott were printed on large paper, and that it is doubtful whether any of CASTELL's Lexicon were printed in that size.

that went along with this set, was on a smaller-sized paper. The same copy was afterwards sold to M. DE SELLE, and is now in the curious collection of the Count DE LAURAGUAIS.

The last leaf but one of the Preface of WALTON's *Polyglott* is canceled in many copies; a circumstantial account of which we are enabled to lay before the Reader in the words of a learned Friend, to whom this Appendix is already most materially indebted.

" To Mr. BOWYER.

" DEAR SIR,

" I will venture to be positive, that I never spoke " a word before this, concerning two different *Dedi-* " *cations* of WALTON's Polyglott; though I remem- " ber something that may have been the occasion of " somebody's thinking I did. The fact is, to the best " of my remembrance,

" I. That when we met at Cambridge [nineteen or " twenty years ago], and, in company with several " other persons, visited the Library of Trinity-Col- " lege, a gentleman, on my taking notice there were " two copies of the said Polyglott, dropt a hint about " exchanging duplicates for other books:

" II. That upon this I made bold to observe—Du- " plicates were not always a mere superfluity, espe- " cially in public libraries, where they might have " been intended to be kept together for curiosity's " sake, on account of some remarkable difference

" between

"between them; which might even be the case with "the very books just taken notice of:

"III. That accordingly, the first volume of one "copy being compared with the first volume of the "other, one of the two was found to have in the "*Preface* what its companion had not, a compliment "for (or acknowledgment of obligation to) *the Lord "Protector and his Council*; which I think is only "preserved in the few copies that were disposed of "before the Restoration, and perhaps not in all of "them; since the same courtly loyalty by which the "Republican leaf containing the said compliment had "been canceled, might very well induce some prudent "or cunning people to tear it out of the copies in "their possession, and get it replaced by its more "loyal substitute, the re-printed leaf; in which Crom-"well's praise is not more to be looked for, than his "bones in the Chapel of Henry the Seventh:

"IV. That in the first edition of the said leaf, "where the compliment for *the Protector and his "Council* offers itself connected with a previous com-"pliment of the same kind for *another Council ante-"cedent to Cromwell's Protectorate*, we found *this* (the "last-mentioned compliment) so introduced and so "worded, as Walton's professed gratitude *naturally* "would have it to be: instead of which, the *second* "edition has nothing but a faint shadow of it, in "a few vague words, introduced only by way of "parenthesis; and so *well chosen*, however, that "uncautious readers might as easily take them for an

" indiſpenſable act of gratitude to the *King's* Council,
" as for a joyful effuſion of gratitude to a Council,
" *ſet up by his enemies:* the different readings of the
" two editions (both with regard to Cromwell or *his*
" Council, and the Privy-Council of the Common-
" wealth) being *exactly ſuch* as you ſhall ſee preſently;
" unleſs I made ſome blunder in tranſcribing, from
" the firſt edition, the moſt material part of the
" paſſage they belong to; which indeed was diſ-
" patched in a great hurry, while the company near
" me were talking *(ut fit)* about any thing elſe.

" Suppoſing then a full agreement of the two edi-
" tions as far as I took notice of no variety, the whole
" paſſage in the firſt muſt be deemed to run as follows:
" ſave only that I ſhall write in large capitals the word
" which makes the beginning of the place that has
" been altered: " Utque eorum conatus qui collatis
" ſtudiis adjumento nobis fuerunt lubenter agnoſci-
" mus, ſic nullo non obſequii genere proſequendi
" Mæcenates munifici, qui ubertim donaria ſua ad
" ſacrum opus promovendum obtulerunt, quorum
" meritis cum pares non ſimus, quod unum poſſu-
" mus, grata mente recolimus, & in devotiſſimæ
" obſervantiæ, perpetuique cultus & obſequii ſignum,
" beneficentiam eorum hic omnibus teſtatam facimus.
" PRIMO autem commemorandi, quorum favore
" chartam à vectigalibus immunem habuimus, quod
" quinque abhinc annis, à *Concilio* ſecretiori, primo
" conceſſum, poſtea à Sereniſſimo D. PROTECTORE
" ejuſque *Concilio*, operis promovendi cauſa, benigne

 " confirma-

"confirmatum & continuatum erat. Quibus sub-
"jungendi, D. Carolus Ludovicus, princeps Pala-
"tin. S. R. I. Elector: Illustrissimus D. Gulielmus
"&c." In *my* copy, which is one of *the loyal sort* [*t*];
"the latter part of the passage (from the word
"PRIMO, down to the name *Carolus*) is reformed or
"transformed in this manner: "Inter hos effusiore
"bonitate labores nostros prosecuti sunt (praeter eos
"quorum favore chartam & vectigalibus immunem
"habuimus) Serenissimus Princeps D. Carolus &c."

"All I can say further on this subject is, that the
"passage I speak of being the only one I collated;
"something more perhaps of the same kind might
"be discovered by a more extensive collation [*u*]. The
"page that contains the passage is the last-but-one
"of the Preface, and the *second* of the re-printed

[*t*] This copy was purchased by Mr. GRENVILLE, for 17 *l.* N.

[*u*] The following variations have been noticed in the leaf of the *Preface* which immediately precedes this, and which appears also to have been re-printed:

P. 7. *l. ult.* imposuimus *(as it stood in what may be called the* Republican *copy) is changed into* apposuimus

P. 8. *l.* 7. exhibeatur *into* exhibetur

l. 27. impulerint ut opus *into* impulerint ut temporibus hisce turbulentis, cum Religio et Literæ ostracismum quasi passæ videantur, opus.

The late indefatigable Mr. HOLLIS took great pains to discover the variations between these two *Prefaces*; but those abovementioned are all which have been observed. B. & N.

"leaf;

"leaf; in the first of which (at a small distance "from the bottom) I observe that Walton, mention-"ing what we may call his *literary* obligations to "some eminent churchmen, once chaplains to the "unfortunate Charles, not only stiles them *Sacræ* "*Theologiæ Doctores*, but addeth, *& Regi Carolo* τῷ "ἐν ἁγίοις *olim Capellani*. Now this place at least "(I own) I should like to compare with the first im-"pression, and I am sorry I took no notice of it "when I had an opportunity; though indeed not so "sorry on that account, as on account of having "made you stay so long for an answer; which how-"ever would have been ready much sooner, had my "health better agreed with my inclination to shew "myself, Dear Sir,

Balsover-Street,
21 April, 1770.

"Your most obedient humble servant,
"CÆSAR DE MISSY."

Before we quit this edition, we shall take the liberty to observe, on the authority, and in the words, of the critical Friend to whom we are indebted for the Hebrew collation in our Appendix N° II, "that "the latter part of the English Polyglott is much "more incorrectly printed than the former; pro-"bably either owing to the Editor's absence from "the press, or to his being over-fatigued by the "work. This will appear in very obvious instances, "if we cast our eye only on the title *Targum Jona-*"*than* תרגום יונתן. which is often printed falsely "in Hosea, Joel, Amos, Micah, Nahum, Zechariah,

"particularly

"particularly ch. xiv. p. 138, where both words are "misprinted.

"But this is not the worst. The *Hebrew Text* suf- "fered much in several places by the rapidity of the "publication. To multiply instances, would be invi- "dious. I shall therefore mention only one; which "occurs in Gen. xxxiv. 1. where we read דונא in- "stead of דינה.

"There is also in the *Samaritan* Text, according "to the *English* Polyglott, a very grievous blunder; "entirely owing to the heedless transposition of two "words ערב and בקר, Gen. i. 19, by which that "text, in contradiction to itself elsewhere, says, "and "the *morning* and the *evening* were the fourth day." "And this, as the *translation* is different, I take to "have been an error of the Editor, and not of the "copy from which he printed.

"Nor is this the only error, for in Gen. iii. 2. הכחש "is falsely printed for הנחש. So again Gen. iv. 5. "מנחמו for מנחתו.

"But this is nothing, comparatively speaking, to "what we meet with a little below, at ver. 7. where "the second תטיב is unluckily omitted in its proper "place; and then inserted after רבץ, with a repeti- "tion of the word לפתח, to the utter confusion of "the sense of the passage—for, literally translated, it "runs thus: *Nonne, si benefeceris, recipies? si autem "non, ad portam peccatum cubat, benefeceris ad portam.*

"These are glaring instances of unpardonable ne- "gligence; and the more unpardonable, because "they

"they ſtand at the *entrance* of a work, which juſtly "required the greateſt care, and the utmoſt ac- "curacy.

"I ſhall only add, what, in obedience to truth, I "am bound to add, that the *French* Polyglott is en- "tirely clear of all *theſe* errors; and indeed of many "*others*, which the attentive Reader will find ſcat- "tered through the *Engliſh* Polyglott."

In the *Preface* alſo are the following inaccuracies:

P. 1. *laſt paragraph but one*, *r.* καλαχλυσμός *

P. 3. *l.* 1. *for* variant *r.* varient

l. 23. *for* 1615 *r.* 1515

l. 15. *from bottom*, *for* Teſtmenti *r.* Teſtamenti

P. 5. *l.* 23. *for* Quinti *r.* Quarti

l. 22. *from bottom*, *for* Pariſ, ex *r.* Pariſ. quæ ex

l. 5. *from bottom*, *for* opus in *r*, opus ni

P. 6. *l.* 20. *for* occurrunt *r.* occurrit †

l. 17. *from bottom*, *for* Plantina *r.* Plantini ‡

l. 7. *from bottom*, *for* Haphtorarum *r.* Haphtararum

P. 9. *l.* 20. *from bottom*, *for* pertimeſeret *r.* pertimeſceret,

* WALTON's word is καλαχλύσμαλα, which makes an odd appearance at the head of ſuch *inaccuracies* as are mere *Errata Typographica*. The word was probably of his own making; and he might take it to be formed as regularly as ἐκκλύσμαλα. C. D. M.

† The place is certainly faulty, as *quicquid* . . . . *occurrunt* will never paſs. But in what word the fault lies is perhaps not ſo certain. Perhaps, for *quicquid*, we ſhould read *quæcunque*. C. D. M.

‡ This whole line is very bad; and a thorough reviſion of it would, perhaps, make us queſtion whether *Plantiniana* for *Plantina* would not do as well as *Plantini*. C. D. M.

N° IV.

N° IV.

A LIST of all the Cities and Towns in which Books are known to have been publiſhed with Names and Dates in the FIFTEENTH CENTURY; with the Date of the firſt Book, and (as far as can be diſcovered) the Name of the FIRST PRINTER, in each Place. Extracted principally from MAITTAIRE's Annales Typographici Tomi Primi Pars Poſterior, *Amſt.* 1733, p. 187, & ſeqq.

Abbeville,	John du Pré, and Peter Gerard,	1486
St. Alban's,	Anonymus *,	1480
Alcala di Henares [Complutum],	Anonymus,	1494
Aloſt,	Jo. de Weſtphalia, Theodoric Martens,	1474
Altavilla † [in Italy],	Nicholas Bechtermuntze,	1469
Angers,	John Alexander,	1498
Angoulême,	Anonymus,	1493
Antwerp,	Anonymus,	1479
	Gerard Leeu,	1480
Aquila [in Abrunno],	Adam de Rotwil,	1482
Augsburg,	John Bemler,	1466
Avignon,	Nicholas Lepe,	1497
Auſtria (city of) ‡,	Gerard of Flanders,	1480
Bamberg, or *Bemberg*,	John Pfeil,	1499
Barcelona,	Anonymus,	1473
Baſle,	Anonymus,	1475
	Bernard Richel,	1476

* See above, p. 41. † Ibid. p. 87. ‡ Vienna?

Bergamo,	Anonymus,	1498
Berlin,	Anonymus,	1484
Besançon,	Anonymus,	1487
Bois-le-Duc,	Anonymus,	1487
Boulogne *,	Balthazar Azoguidus,	1471
Bourges,	Anonymus,	1493
	Frederik Alemanus,	1496

* According to Mr. MAITTAIRE, the first book printed at Boulogne was OVID's Works, in which is the following colophon: "Hujus opera omnia "Medea excepta & triumpho Cæsaris, & libello illo Pontica lingua composito, "quæ incuria temporum perierunt, Balthazer Azoguidus civis Bononiensis, "honestissimo loco natus, primus in sua civitate artis impressoriæ inventor, &c. "impressit, M.CCCC.LXXI." This claim is, however, in some measure overthrown, by a book which appeared in Dr. ASKEW's Catalogue, N° 2837. "Ptolomæi (Claudii) Cosmographiæ Libri VIII. Bonon. Impress. per Dominicum de Lapis, 1462." Of this edition, M. DE BURE (Bibliographie Instructive, 1768, Liv. rares, tom. I. N° 4192) has given a very particular account, exactly agreeing with Dr. ASKEW's copy, which I examined; and which was purchased, at his sale, for The Royal Library, at the price of fifteen guineas and a half. M. DE BURE observes, "that it is so extremely "scarce, as to have escaped the attention of most collectors; and that even those "who have had an idea of its existence have spoken of it in a most imperfect "manner, from not having had an opportunity of seeing it; whence many dis-"putes have arisen on the authenticity of its date." It is divided into two parts; the first containing the printed text, the second twenty-six geographical charts, each printed on a whole sheet. At the end of the first part, is this colophon:

"Hic finit cosmographia ptolomei impressa
"op'a dom.ni de lapis civis bononie'sis.
"ANNO M.CCCC.LXII.
"MENSE IVNII XXIII."

On a very close examination of this date, it must be owned, no signs of deception appear; there has certainly been nothing erased; nor is it at all probable that any artifice has been used. M. DE BURE very ingeniously supposes the like mistake may have happened as is pointed out (p. 23.) in JENSON's *Decor Puellarum*; and that, an x being omitted, we should read M.CCCC.LXXII. I cannot but think this highly probable; and, in confirmation of it, would observe, that this edition of PTOLOMY has signatures (though irregularly disposed, as if not fully acquainted with their use), which have not been noticed in any book of earlier date than 1470. See above, p. 28. N.

Brescia,

Brescia,	Henry of Cologn, Statius Gallicus,	1474
Bruges,	Colard Mansion,	1476
Brunæ [Q. *Brunswick*],	Anonymus,	1488
Brussels,	Anonymus,	1476
Buda,	Andrew Hess,	1473
Burgdorf,	Anonymus,	1475
Caen,	Jacobus Durand,	1480
Caragossa [*Saragossa*],	Anonymus,	1491
	Pablo Hurus,	1499
Coll,	Bonus Gallus,	1478
Cologn,	John Koelhoff,	1470
Constance,	Anonymus,	1489
Constantinople,	Anonymus,	1490
Convent of Regulars at Schoonhoven,	Anonymus,	1500
In agro CAREGIO *,		1489
Cosenza,	Octavius Salmonius,	1478
Cracow,	Anonymus,	1500
Cremona,	Bernard de Misintis,	1485
Deventer [in Overyssel], a city in Lower Saxony,	Anonymus,	1472
	Richard Paffroit,	1477
Delft,	Jacob Jacops,	1477
Dijon,	Anonymus,	1491
Dole,	John Hebertus,	1492
Eichstedt,	Michael Reiser,	1488
Erfort,	Anonymus,	1482
Ergow,	Elias fil. Eliæ,	1470
Estingen [in Suabia],	Conrad Fyner,	1475
Ferrara,	Andrew Gallus,	1471
Florence,	Bernard and Dominick Cenini,	1472
Friburg,	Kilianus,	1493
Gaieta,	Justo,	1488
Ghent,	Anonymus,	1483
	Arend de Keysere,	1485

* Q. Where situated?

Gebennensi *,	Anonymus,	1481
Geneva,	Anonymus,	1478
	Jacobus Arnollet,	1498
Genoa,	Mathias Moravus,	1474
Gentiæ [Q. *Ghent*],	Anonymus,	1480
S. Giacomo de Rinoli [a monastery at Florence],	Dom. de Pistoria,	1477
Gouda,	Anonymus,	1478
	Gerard Leeu,	1480
Granada,	Anonymus,	1496
Hagenau,	Anonymus,	1475
	Henry Gran,	1496
Harleim,	Jacobus Begaard,	1484
Hasseleti,	Anonymus,	1481
Heidelberg,	Anonymus,	1480
	Jacobus Knoblocker,	1489
Ingolstadt,	Anonymus,	1492
Lantriguier,	John Casney,	1499
Leipsic,	Anonymus,	1481
	Marcus Brandt,	1484
Leiria,	Anonymus,	1494
Lewis,	Anonymus,	1479
Leyden,	Anonymus,	1497
Lignitz [*Lignis*],	Anonymus,	1481
Lintz,	Peter Affelin,	1500
Lisbon,	Anonymus,	1491
London,	Anonymus,	1481
	Will. de Machlinia, Q.	1481
	John Lettou †,	1481
	Richard Pynson,	1493
	Nicholas le Conte,	1494
	Julianus Notaire & J. Barbier,	1498

* In the book whence this *Adjective* was taken, it was probably preceded by a *Substantive* indicating some place of the *Cévennes*. C. D. M.

† See above, p. 39.

Lovain,

Louvain,	Jo. de Westphalia,	1473
Lubeck,	Anonymus,	1471
Lunenberg,	John Luce,	1493
Lyons,	Bartholomew Buyer,	1477
Madrid,	Anonymus,	1494
Magdeburg,	Anonymus,	1483
Mantua,	Tho. Septemcastrensis & socii,	1472
Memmingen,	Anonymus,	1483
	Albert Kune,	1490
Mentz,	Fust and Schoeffer,	1457
Messana,	Anonymus,	1486
	Andrew de Brugis,	1497
Milan,	Anthony Zarot,	1470
Mirandula,	Anonymus,	1496
Modena,	Balthazar de Struciis,	1477
Monreale [in Sicily],	Dominick de Nivaldis & filii,	1481
Monte Monachorum,	John Senfenschmidt,	1481
Munster,	John Limburgus,	1486
Nantes,	Stephen Larcher,	1488
Naples,	Sixtus Riessenger,	1471
Nimeguen,	Jo. de Westphalia,	1479
Noremberg,	Anthony Coburger,	1471
Offenbach,	Anonymus,	1496
Oppenheim,	Anonymus,	1498
Ortona,	Judæi Soncinates,	1496
Oudenarde,	John Cæsar,	1480
Oxford,	Anonymus [Q. Corsellis],	1468
	T. R. *	1480
	Theodoric Rood,	1481
Padua,	Bartholomew de Valdezochio,	1472
Palermo,	Andrew de Wormacia,	1477
Pampelune,	William de Brocario,	1496
Paris, [Q. 1464? †]	Ulric Gering, Martin Crantz, and Michael Friburger,	1470

* See above, p. 31. † See above, p. 106.

Parma,

Parma,	Anonymus,	1472
	Stephen Corallus,	1473
Pavia,	Jacobus de Sancto Petro,	1477
Perpignan,	J. Rosembach,	1500
Perugia,	Stephen Arns,	1481
Pesaro,	Anonymus,	1494
Pescia,	Sigismund Rodt,	1488
Piacenza,	Jo. Peter de Ferratis,	1475
Pigneroli,	Jacobus de Rubeis,	1475
Pisa,	Anonymus,	1482
	Gregory de Gente,	1485
Poitiers,	Anonymus, in ædibus Canonici Ecclesiæ B. Hilarii,	1479
	John de Marnef,	1500
Provins [in Champagne],	William Tavernier,	1497
Quilambourg,	Anonymus,	1480
Reggio,	Prosp. Odoardus, Alb. Maguli,	1481
Reutlingen,	John Averbach,	1469
Rimini,	Anonymus,	1486
Rome,	Conrad Sweynheim, Arnold Pannartz,	1467
Rostoch,	Presbyteri et Clerici Congregationis domus viridis horti,	1476
Rouen,	John le Bourgois,	1488
Salamanca,	Anonymus,	1495
Salonichi,	Anonymus,	1493
Scandiani,	Peregrin Pasqual,	1435
Schoonhoven,	Anonymus, in Conventu Regularium,	1500
Sciedami, Sedani, Sedan,	Anonymus,	1498
Seville,	Paul de Colonia,	1491
Siena,	Sigismund Rot,	1489
Soncino,	Anonymus,	1484
	Abraham fil. Rabbi Hhaiim,	1488
Sorten Monasterium,	Anonymus,	1478

Spire,

Spire,	Petrus Drach,	1477
Stockholm,	John Faber,	1495
Strasburgh *,	Henry Eggestein,	1471
Sublaco-Abbey,	Anonymus,	1465
Toledo,	Anonymus,	1486
	John Teller,	1495
Tolouse,	Anonymus,	1486
Treca,	Anonymus,	1480
	William le Rouge,	1492
Treviso,	Girard de Lisa de Flandria,	1471
Tubingen,	Fred. Meynberger,	1488
Tunis,	John Fabri and Jo. de Petro,	1474
Tours,	Anonymus, in domo Gulielmi Archiep. Turonensis,	1467
Valentia,	Anonymus,	1475
	Alphonsus de Orta,	1496
Venice,	Rotdolt †,	1468
	Jo. de Spira,	1469
	Jo. & Vindelin. de Spira, Nicolaus Jenson, Christopher Baldarfer,	1470
Verona,	Jo. Nicolai filius,	1472
Vicenza,	Hermanus Levilapis,	1475
Vienna,	Anonymus,	1481
Vienne [in Dauphiné],	Peter Schenck,	1484
Viterbo,	Anonymus,	1480
Ulm,	John Zeiner,	1473
Urbino,	Anonymus,	1484
Udine,	Anonymus,	1498
Utrecht,	Nicholas Ketzlaer, Gerard de Lumpt,	1473
Westminster,	William Caxton,	1477
	Winand de Word,	1495
Zwoll,	Anonymus,	1479

* MENTEL and EGGESTEIN most probably practised the profession in this city soon after 1462. See above, p. 96, 97. † See above, p. 23.

ADDENDUM

ADDENDUM to p. 135.

Dr. EDMUND CASTELL, who had been many years a member of Emanuel College in Cambridge, was, in his advanced age, admitted into St. John's in that univerſity. He was choſen Arabic profeſſor in 1666; to which preferment he was intitled by his merit as an Orientaliſt. He had, ſome years before, given very eminent proofs of his abilities, in the laborious work of the Polyglott. Great part of his life was ſpent in compiling his "Lexicon Heptaglotton," on which he beſtowed incredible pains and expence, even to the breaking of his conſtitution, and exhauſting of his fortune, having expended no leſs than twelve thouſand pounds upon that work. At length, when it was printed, the copies remained unſold upon his hands. He died in 1685; and lies buried in the church of Higham Gobyon in Bedfordſhire, of which he was rector. It appears from the inſcription on his monument, which he erected in his life-time, that he was chaplain to CHARLES II. He bequeathed all his Oriental manuſcripts to the univerſity of Cambridge, on condition that his name ſhould be written on every copy in the collection. See more of him, at the end of "THOMAS DE ELMHAM," publiſhed by HEARNE, p. 356. 427. and in LELAND's "Collectanea," by the ſame Editor, vol. VI. p. 80; alſo in Dr. POCOCKE's "Life," fol. p. 50, Notes; and p. 66. Thus far from GRANGER, vol. II. p. 193. —Some further anecdotes of Dr. CASTELL may be ſeen in the Life of LIGHTFOOT.

N° V.

On the COMPLUTENSIAN POLYGLOTT.

An unfinished Essay [a].

THE fifth volume contains the New Testament in two columns, one (on the right hand) for the Vulgate, printed in a pretty neat sizeable Gothic letter: and

[a] The apology which has been so handsomely made in the unfinished advertisement prefixed to our late worthy Friend's Fables *, which (the advertisement only excepted) had been ready for publication some time before his death, will account for the imperfect state in which these papers appear, and will be the justest tribute we can pay to his memory: "Il importe peu au Public de savoir les raisons qui en retardèrent "alors la publication; qu'il suffise de dire, qu'après s'être remis "à cet ouvrage l'Auteur le suspendit de-nouveau, pour rendre "à un savant et ancien ami (dans un Païs voisin) un service "litéraire, qui demandoit quelques recherches assez minu-"tieuses, au milieu desquelles la mort l'arrêta, sans qu'on "puisse dire qu'elle le surprît. Depuis quelques années il "étoit dans l'habitude de considérer chaque jour, qui se "renouvelloit pour lui, comme un jour-de-plus ajouté par la "Bonté divine, à une vie qui avoit déja ateint les bornes "les plus ordinaires de la vie humaine; et cela sans que "l'égalité de son humeur, sans que sa gaieté naturelle en "fussent le moins du monde altérées †. Soutenu dans les

* "Paraboles ou Fables et aûtres petites narrations d'un citoyen de la "Republique Chrétienne du dix-huitième siècle: par CESAR DE-"MISSY. Troisième édition; revue et corrigée par l'Auteur, 1776," 8vo; sold by *Sewell* and *Elmsley*, and ornamented with a remarkable likeness of the Author.

† Mr. DE MISSY died Aug. 10, 1775; aged 72 years and 10 weeks.

and one for the Greek, printed in characters remarkable, not only by their uncommon largeneſs, but by their very form, which might be called a ſtiff and ſomewhat aukward imitation of moſt Mſſ. of the middle age. LE LONG obſerves that they are without *any* ſpirits or accents, *ſine ullis ſpirituum & accentuum notis*: and for this he had as his vouchers the very editors of the book, who ſay the ſame thing both in their Greek and Latin Prefaces. He might however have added, and not improperly, that the acute accent, which ſtrikes the eye in every line except on monoſyllables, was not employed as a Greek one, but merely as an *Apex* (κεραία), or little note, in order to guide those who want it in the pronunciation or modulation of the words, or as the Latin Preface expreſſes it, *In prolatione modulationéve.* WETSTEIN, p. 118, of his *Prolegomena*, obſerves that it was done as cuſtomary with Latin

" chagrins et les embarras qu'il trouvoit ſur ſa route, par " une conviction raiſonnée des grandes Vérités qu'il a " prêchées juſques à la fin, avec un zele qui naiſſoit de cette " conviction, il n'avoit, à proprement parler, d'autre déſir, " d'autre objet, dans toutes ſes actions, dans ſes amuſe- " mens même, que la propagation de ces Verités. Rem- " pli de la bienveuillance la plus ſincère, de la charité " la plus cordiale, pour le Genre-humain, il ne voyoit que le " Chriſtianiſme bien-entendu qui pût rendre le Genre-humain " heureux, et il mettoit ſon propre bonheur à en répandre " la connoiſſance."—Theſe ſtriking particulars in the character of Mr. DE MISSY will be the more acceptable to the Reader, when he perceives that they are the amiable effuſions of friendſhip, enlivened by conjugal veneration. N.

transcribers

transcribers of Greek: expressing or rather explaining the thing in this manner: *More solis Latinis librariis Græca describentibus usitato, syllabis producendis accentum acutum apposuerunt:* which, whether right or wrong, being liable to some misunderstanding, obliges me to note, I°. That the acute accent is used, not only where the syllable must be long *(syllabis producendis)*: but also wherever any Greek accent is required by the common rules of the Greek Grammar: II°. That the hint of thus using the acute might perhaps have been taken from the method already devised (I suppose) of using it so in some Latin Rituals, in which, for example, you may find, *Laudáte púeri Dóminum . . . . Bénedic Dómine púeris ístis . . . .* with this difference however, that Latin dissyllables having always the accent, whether marked or not, on the first syllable, they of course could easily remain without the mark of it in such books: and that this not being the case with the Greek, our COMPLUTENSIAN editors prudently allowed an accent to such words on that of the two syllables which had a right to it. Some other more minute particulars I willingly pass over: but one there is which, I think, should not have escaped observation. It is the constant omission of the *iota* wherever we are used to find it either *subscriptum* or *adscriptum*; a peculiarity the more remarkable, because it obtains, not only in the Greek books of the four former volumes, where usual spirits and accents are admitted, but even in such parts of the fifth as enjoy the same prerogative on account of

their being only acceſſaries to the New Teſtament; and of which one, at leaſt, ſhould not have paſſed unnoticed by Le Long. I mean that part of the volume which contains, together with a very compendious *Introduction* to the Greek language, a Greek Lexicon, by the help of which a beginner is enabled to go through all the books of the New Teſtament, and two of the Old into the bargain: *Ecce enim vobis damus Lexicon copioſum . . . . In quo omnia vocabula totius Novi Teſtamenti: & inſuper Sapientie & Eccleſiaſtici continentur: & eorum multiplices ſignificationes copioſe exponuntur:* ſays the writer of the *Introduction.* At the bottom of the title-page we have an account of all the contents, which ends with theſe words: *Poſtremo loco librum claudunt interpretationes omnium totius Novi Teſtamenti vocabulorum que tam Grecam quam Hebraicam & Chaldaicam ſortita ſunt etymologiam ab initio Matthei uſque ad finem Apocalypſeos.* Theſe *interpretationes*, however, in my copy, are placed immediately before the New Teſtament: and the volume cloſes with the Lexicon. The known date of 1514 January the 10th is taken from the laſt page of the New Teſtament; and the other contents of the volume, it may be ſuppoſed, were finiſhed before or very ſoon after: ſo that if, according to the received accounts of the matter, and ſtrictly ſpeaking, it was not ſuffered to be publiſhed till 1522, it muſt have lain hidden for nine years. Is this very likely? But however it be: as what little I have to propoſe, relating to that queſtion, is intimately connected with

my obſervations on the ſixth volume, let me now take it in hand.

This volume, which, for an obvious reaſon, taken from the natural order of matters in the whole ſet, is not improperly called the *laſt*, was nevertheleſs ready for publication ſo ſoon as about fifteen months after the New Teſtament; the *Vocabulary* which it contains being finiſhed the 17th of March, 1515; and its companion the *Grammar*, on the laſt day of May in the ſame year. Now, if conjecturing that from that day ſome copies of it (as well as from an earlier date ſome copies of the New Teſtament) were dealt out by way of ſale or as preſents, ſhould be deemed, or even found contrary to fact; the falſe conjecture, I hope, would be judged excuſeable at leaſt, after reading the following words of the Preface: *In communem Chriſtiane reipublice utilitatem dedimus novum teſtamentum Greco Latinoque ſermone impreſſum; adjecto inſuper quam utiliſſimo Lexico Grecarum omnium dictionum que in eo continentur: daturi quam primum vetus inſtrumentum (quod jam nunc in prelo eſt) Hebraica Chaldaica Grecaque lingua cum ſingulis Latinis interpretationibus excuſſum. En premitimus vobis veluti pro deguſtamento & preludio operis copioſiſſimum Hebreorum Chaldeorumque vocabulorum dictionarium.* Such expreſſions are certainly ſo much in the ſtile of Editors publiſhing a work volume by volume, that any one might naturally be led to conceive this was the caſe with the COMPLUTENSIAN Editors; with regard at leaſt to the two firſt-finiſhed volumes. Sufficient reaſons

sons appear, or may be imagined, why they should have wished to publish them in that manner; and if they would, what could have hindered them, especially at that time, so long before LUTHER by his bold attempts of reformation, or even ERASMUS by his Greek and Latin New Testament, had made any noise? ERASMUS published his New Testament in 1516, and dedicated it with an honest freedom to Pope LEO the Tenth. Might not the great, the powerful and antient XIMENES have taken equal liberty with the same young, and newly-made Pope, when his New Testament was finished in January 1514? And supposing he deemed it decent, or even necessary, to be provided beforehand with a Papal approbation, could he not have procured it as easily as ERASMUS, upwards of four years after (in September 1518), procured from his Holiness a Brief which he might prefix to his then-preparing second edition, and *which*, as Dr. JORTIN expresses it, *might stamp some authority upon it?* If XIMENES's New Testament being finished in 1514 was not kept a secret, there must certainly have been some demand for it: and that his ostensible progresses in dispatching the six volumes were not a secret, may be inferred, with some probability at least, from what GOMECIUS relates of the last, who tells us (*folio verso* 38), that on the very day when the finishing hand was put to the last volume, the Printer, ARNALD WILLIAM DE BROCARIO, sent his son JOHN, elegantly dressed, to present a copy of the said volume to XIMENES, who,

on

on receiving it, looked up to Heaven with this exclamation, *Grates tibi ago, summe Christe, quòd rem magnopere à me curatam ad optatum finem perduxeris;* and then addressing himself to his *Familiares*, spoke to this purpose: *Equidem cum multa ardua & difficilia reip. causa hactenus gesserim, nihil est amici, de quo mihi magis gratulari debeatis, quàm de hac bibliorum editione: quæ una sacros religionis nostræ fontes tempore perquam necessario aperit: unde multò purior theologica disciplina haurietur, quàm à rivis postea deductis.* All this, I think, bears no appearance of a mystery: unless it should be proved that by the Cardinal's *Familiares*, who were witnesses of the ceremony, we must understand none but the confidents of the secret, not excluding the youth who presented the Book. It may be objected indeed, that * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * * * * * * * [b]

Of the same Sixth Volume LE LONG speaks, as containing, *Vocabularium Hebraicum & Chaldaicum totius Veteris Testamenti cum introductione artis Grammaticæ Hebraicæ & Dictionario Græco* [c]. And this account

[b] Here the MS. unfortunately breaks off; but the margin contains the following memorandum: 'N. B. P. 44. 'of the Appendix to CAVE's Hist. Liter. "Anno 1507. "dignitate cardinalitia a Julio 2 pontifice donatus fuit; "*inquisitor fidei generalis* per universum Castellæ regnum "mox constitutus."

[c] On a separate leaf Mr. DE MISSY made this remark: 'Note also H. WARTON's account p. 244. col. 2. "Pro-"diit

account alſo cannot paſs without a touch. The title-page refers the Reader to a ſubſequent Addreſs, where he will find a more explicit enumeration of the Contents: and in this indeed ſome mention is made of a Greek Lexicon: but, had LE LONG read it with due attention, he would ſoon have ſeen that the Author in that place was ſpeaking of what had been done in the volume of the New Teſtament. To the Vocabulary are ſubjoined, *Interpretationes Hebraicorum; Chaldeorum; & Grecorum nominum; veteris ac Novi Teſtamenti ſecundum ordinem alphabeti.* And as I can by no means ſuſpect LE LONG of having miſtaken this for a *Greek Lexicon*, let it be noticed only as an article by him omitted, though in another place (of which by and by) he takes notice of a piece cloſely joined with it; after which comes, by him alſo unregarded, a Latin Index with proper references to the great Hebrew and Chaldaic Vocabulary: the Grammar which follows the Latin Index cloſing the whole.—The piece, of which I ſaid he took notice in another place, is thus indicated by him: *Catalogus eorum quæ in utroque Teſtamento aliter ſcripta ſunt vitio Scriptorum quam in Græco, auctore Alphonſo de Zamora:* with a vague reference to the

"diit opus iſtud pulcherrimum Leoni 10, pontifici nun-
"cupatum, *Compluti* excuſum ſex voluminibus in folio: quo-
"rum *poſtremum* anno 1515 praelo exiit:" and that, juſt
"before, he had ſaid: "*Acceſſit volumine* POSTREMO *He-*
"*braeorum, Chaldaeorum*, & Græcorum *Vocabulorum Ono-*
"*maſticon copioſiſſimum.*"

Sixth

Sixth Volume of the COMPLUTENSIAN Polyglott: and the place, where he thus indicates it, is in the ſecond ſection of his laſt chapter, among the collections of various readings, under the ſpecial title of VARIAE LECTIONES GRAECAE. Now I think I might ſafely affirm, that, in the whole volume referred-to, the only piece he could mean was that which, at the end of the *Interpretationes Nominum*, is thus introduced: *Nomina que ſequuntur ſunt illa que in utroque teſtamento vicio ſcriptorum ſunt aliter ſcripta quā in Hebreo & Greco & in aliquibus bibliis noſtris antiquis. In primo autem ordine ponūtur ipſa nomina ſicut ſunt ī bibliis noſtris modernis: in ſecundo vero ordine vel e regione ponūtur ſicut ſunt in Hebreo & Greco & in p̄fatis bibliis noſtris antiquis: & hoc per ordinem alphabeti.* What ſhall I ſay more? Let every one judge for himſelf, how properly ſuch a piece could be ranked among the collections of *Greek various Readings* [*d*]. Neither ſhall I ſo much as aſk pardon for having dwelt ſo long upon this volume: its peculiar and well-known ſcarcity being, I think, a ſufficient apology for what I have done. GOMECIUS wrote, two hundred and five years ago (*folio verſo* 37), that it was wanting in ſome copies, through the careleſſneſs of certain people (*quorundam incuriâ*) who had undertaken to keep them ſafe (*qui eos aſſervandos ſuſcepe-*

[*d*] In the margin of Mr. DE MISSY's MſS. was this remark: "N. B. From the abovementioned Preface, what "the intention of XIMENES ſeems to have been, with regard "to the gradual publication of the Volumes."

rant). I wish he had been bold enough to tell us who those people were, as it is quite improbable that the Books were left in the keeping of the Printer, who no doubt would have kept them with more care.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * [*e*]

In short, I cannot help suspecting the COMPLUTENSIAN New Testament of being antedated: and should I be asked what could engage the Editors to play such a trick, I may answer, It could be a jealousy of appearing as earlier editors of so notable a work than ERASMUS, who had published his New Testament not far from the beginning of 1516: a jealousy, I say, of the same kind as that of GENEBRARD, who, seeing TREMELLIUS's edition of the Syriac New Testament in Hebrew characters printed together with the Greek Text by H. STEPHENS so soon as 1569, would by all means have it that TREMELLIUS had made it his by stealth *(per plagium sibi vindicavit)*, from the Antwerp Polyglott, before this was published in 1572; notwithstanding TREMELLIUS's Preface, testifying that he had performed his work so early as 1565, which is two years earlier than BODERIANUS himself pretended to have performed his; thinking it probably sufficient to vindicate his own priority and honesty. See LE LONG, p. 44 and 45, of the folio edition [*f*].

[*e*] Here is another chasm in the MS.

[*f*] Mr. DE MISSY's beautiful copy of the COMPLUTENSIAN Polyglott was sold to THE ROYAL LIBRARY for forty guineas, the exact price it had formerly cost him.

N° VI.

N° VI.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS.

P. 7. l. 3. Queen MARY incorporated the Company of Stationers, with an expreſs deſign of preventing "ſeditious "and heretical books, which were daily printed, to the re-"newal and propagating *very great and deteſtable hereſies* "*againſt the faith, and ſound Catholic doctrine of Holy Mother* "*the Church*;" and impowered them "to ſeize, take away, "have, burn, or convert to their own uſe, all books which "ſhould be printed contrary to the form of any ſtatute, act, "or proclamation, made or to be made." Theſe were the regulations of a *Catholic* Princeſs; but an equal authority was given by her *Proteſtant* Succeſſors, who muſt certainly have had a very different opinion of *ſeditious and heretical books.*

Ibid. l. 16. An epitaph on NICHOLAS CORSELLIS (who died Oct. 19, 1674) has been produced, by the writers on both ſides of the queſtion, with very different views. Thoſe who eſpouſe the ſentiments of Dr. MIDDLETON maintain, that the idea of being deſcended from the earlieſt Engliſh printer was a mere fancy, ſuggeſted by what they call the *fictitious* record of ATKYNS, ſince NICHOLAS was unable to trace his pedigree farther back than 1664; and Mr. SALMON, in particular, miſtaking the intention of the epitaph, gravely obſerves, "that *its date* is inconſiſtent with the "time that Printing was brought into England;" as if it were pretended that NICHOLAS was the introducer of the art. Mr. MEERMAN, on the contrary, who has ably vindicated ATKYNS and the record, adduces this very epitaph

as an additional argument; and, after clearly proving that ZEAGAN CORSELLIS, the father of NICHOLAS, was descended from a family of good note in the 15th and 16th centuries, satisfactorily accounts for the pedigree's having been continued no farther back than NICHOLAS.

P. 7. l. 18. JOHN BAGFORD, by profession a bookseller, frequently travelled into Holland and other parts, in search of scarce books and valuable prints, and brought a vast number into this kingdom, the greatest part of which were purchased by the earl of OXFORD. In the Philosophical Transactions, for April 1707, appeared an Essay on the Invention of Printing, by Mr. JOHN BAGFORD,; with an account of his Collections for the same. A list of these Collections may be seen in the Catalogue of Harleian Mss. vol. II. N° 5892—5910. BAGFORD died May 5, 1716, aged 65.

P. 17. l. 18. This history by BAGFORD is yet unpublished. It is described in the Harleian Catalogue, under the title of, "N° 5901. A book in folio, shewing the progress of printing at Oxford."

P. 20. *Add to note* [K]. After so much has been said about the Lambeth Record *, it may not be amiss to add what ENSCHEDIUS, an intimate friend of Mr. MEERMAN, subjoins to his account of it: "Cæterùm omnem lapidem "movimus, ut hujus Manuscripti copiam haberemus, et ideo "anno 1740 binas Literas ad nunc temporis summè Reve-"rendum Archipræsulem Cantuariensem, LORD JOHN †,

* It is no small confirmation of what we have advanced in favour of CORSELLIS, that our arguments have had the honour of being adopted by Sir JAMES BURROW, in his valuable Reports; who justly observes, "that it is very unsafe to trust to common history; and necessary to recur "to original testimonies, if we would know the state of facts with "exactness." Vol. IV. p. 2417.

† Dr. JOHN POTTER.

"scripsimus,

"ſcripſimus, qui etiam pro ſuo ſingulari, quo rempublicam "literariam fovet, favore non defuit, quin omnia perquirenda "curaret, qua pro inſigni humanitate, debitas ipſi hic agimus "gratias: verùm cùm Archivum dictorum Archiepiſco-"porum ſubinde negligentius habitum fuerit; hoc Manu-"ſcriptum, quod dolemus, ibidem reperiri non potuit; ſed "ſufficit quod ATKYNS teſtetur, ſe ejus Apographum in "manibus habuiſſe, illudque accepiſſe a Viro quodam Reve-"rendo, qui illud tum, cum Archivo eidem præeſſet, ex "Autographo deſcripſerit." *Annus Sæcularis Tertius inventæ Typographiæ, Harlemi, apud Iſaakum et Johannem Enſchede*, 1742, p. 74.—In this treatiſe of ENSCHEDIUS, which is very little known in England, is a beautiful view of the market-place at Harleim *, and of the ſpacious manſion formerly inhabited by LAURENTIUS, which is now divided into three houſes.

P. 55. Dr. MIDDLETON's catalogue of CAXTON's Books is omitted; being confined only to thoſe which are in the Public Library at Cambridge.

P. 85. The note [O] was printed before we had an opportunity of ſeeing what M. DE BURE has ſaid on this earlieſt edition of the Bible, which he deſcribes under the title of "Biblia Sacra Latina Vulgata: Editio primæ ve-"tuſtatis, æneis characteribus, abſque loci & anni notâ, ſed "typis Moguntinis Johannis Fuſt evulgata: Opus longe "rariſſimum, cujus Pariſiis adverſatur Exemplar in Biblio-"thecâ Mazarinæâ, 2 vol. in fol." The types are larger than thoſe of the *Speculum*, and leſs than what were uſed in the *Pſalters* of 1457 and 1459; and, though it has no date, is clearly fixed to the year 1450. It is ſuppoſed by M. DE BURE to be the edition which FUST ſold in France as a manuſcript. The reaſon for this ſuppoſition, however, is

* See above, p. 58.

the

the less satisfactory, as it is grounded merely on the improbability of FUST's attempting such an artifice with the edition of 1462, after taking pains to tell the world that it was performed *artificiosâ adinventione imprimendi seu characterizandi absque calami exercitatione:* and the learned Frenchman's description of the latter edition affords a very probable argument against his opinion on the subject. After having mentioned *eight* several copies of it now existing at Paris (seven of them on vellum, and only one on paper), he exhibits *three* various colophons, with a wish that the variation could be accounted for. We submit to this ingenious writer, whether it be not natural to suppose that the colophon received the several alterations whilst it was actually at press; which is the more likely, as some copies have it in black, and others in red. If this be the case, does it not naturally follow, that such copies as were intended to pass for manuscripts were worked-off without any colophon at all? In confirmation of this conjecture, there is good authority for asserting that FUST never traded to Paris till July 1466, when printing was unknown in that city; and that the copies he then sold *de arte characterizandi omnino silebant.* See MEERMAN, vol. I. p. 154.—The edition of 1450 is uncommonly rare, only three copies of it having ever been taken notice of; one of them in the king of PRUSSIA's library, a second in the BENEDICTINE Convent near Mentz, and a third in the collection of Cardinal MAZARIN.—That of 1462, though exceedingly valuable, is much more frequently met with. It is, like the former, in 2 volumes folio, but printed in Gothic characters; and is justly esteemed a very beautiful performance.

P. 86. M. DE BURE gives a very full account of the celebrated Psalter of 1457; and proves very clearly that the edition

edition of 1459 (of which no more than *one copy* * is at present known) is different from the former.

P. 90. *Note, after* process, *add*, If the copper *matrix* were to be melted, and so receive the face of the letter from the punch; a roughness would be left by the fusion of the metal, which would be propagated to all the letters cast in such *matrix*, and would render them unfit for use.

Ibid. *Add to note* [U]. "Mr. MEERMAN's explanation "is intricate at least; and it leaves us besides to wonder, not "only how *forms of letters* could be bare bodies or pieces of "metal *without letters*, but how so considerable a part of the "invention as the matrices should have been only men-"tioned indirectly, as a thing well known before. A cor-"rection, however, seems absolutely necessary. Neither can "it be denied that Mr. MEERMAN, by inserting *ex eis*, "clears TRITHEMIUS from the reproach of saying, that even "matrices were made by way of *fusion*; and thus far I like his "correction so well, that I am sorry to see the new difficulties "arising from it in the context, notwithstanding his elabo-"rate explanation; which, had I room and leisure to make "it plainer by a compleat paraphrase, I should rather leave "as it is; because all the machines required for such a "paraphrase would only serve to set in a clearer light the "intricacy of the affair, while something better perhaps may "be done to obtain what seems to have been Mr. MEERMAN's "chief end. Something certainly is faulty in TRITHE-"MIUS's phrase, *fundendi formas . . . quas ipse matrices nomi-"nabant*. But then, why should not the fault be suspected "to lie in that very unlucky word which properly consti-"tutes the acknowledged absurdity of the phrase? I think, "in short, that by some spot or accidental stroke of "the pen in the MS. the word *cudendi* might have been

* Formerly belonging to M. DE BOZE, and now to the President DE COTTE.

"mistaken

"mistaken for *fudendi:* nay, I think, that even the more "similar word *tundendi* might have been employed by "TRITHEMIUS, as being not altogether improper, since "it could be interpreted, at least with the help of some in-"dulgence, by *Tudite vel tudicula imprimendi*; not to say "that, according to the well-known observation, *Verbum "simplex saepe ponitur pro composito*, the simple word *tundendi* "might be taken in a sense analagous to the compound "*pertundendi*. I can say no more at present." C. D. M.

P. 92. *Add to note* [Z]. "Having not Mr. KÖHLERUS's "book, I can but guess how *Deborah* comes in there "with *Christina*; and the only thing I can guess is, that "KÖHLERUS, in order to evince the possibility of *Dynen* "being a diminutive of *Christina*, had alledged, as an ex-"ample of a still shorter diminutive, the use of *Deb* for "*Deborah:* which if he did, Mr. MEERMAN's seeming to "wonder at it may be tolerably accounted for. But what "if, instead of these diminutives that retain only the begin-"ning of a name, he had mentioned some of those which "retain only the latter part of it, and that not always en-"tire, as our *Bell* for *Arabella*, *Mun* for *Edmund*, *Tony* for "*Antony*, *Sander* for *Alexander*, *Bet* or *Betty* for *Elizabeth?* "Mr. MEERMAN's own book furnishes us (vol. II. p. 79.) "with a list of German names, among which, *Hans* clearly "appears for *Johans* or *Johannes*, *Claus* for *Nicolaus*, and, if "I mistake not, *Nese* for *Agnes*. Such examples make it "certainly plausible enough that *Tynen*, or the same lovingly "softened into *Dynen*, might be a diminutive of *Christynen*, "which (or else *Christynin)* I take to be the feminine for "*Christyn*; as *Fustin*, or *Fusten*, is the feminine for *Fust*. See "vol. I. p. 184. where this very daughter of *Fust* is called "*Fusthin*, but where *th* imports no more than *t*. And sup-"posing now that all this should be deemed insufficient to

"solve the question how JOHN SCHOEFFER could call his "mother *Christina*, while it appears that his father, in a "convention passed between himself and his kinsman, *John* "*Fust*, son of *John*, has called her by the name of *Dynen*; "there is, I think, another solution ready, in the obvious "supposition that she might have two names, and that he, "especially in a writing passed with a kinsman, might have "chosen, as a loving husband, to call her familiarly by what "I must be allowed to term the favourite name." C. D. M.

P. 93. l. ult. *Add*, See more of this Psalter, p. 174.

P. 102. Dr. ASKEW's copy of the Psalter of 1481 was sold, to THE ROYAL LIERARY, for sixteen guineas: Mr. DE MISSY's was bought by Dr. HUNTER for nineteen pounds. According to M. DE BURE, it has little merit except as being the earliest edition; yet it is exceedingly scarce. The colophon is, "Impressum Mediolani, M.CCCC.LXXI. die 20 Septembris."—The Psalter of 1486, in 4to, is also very scarce, and little known. Dr. ASKEW had a copy of it, which was sold for four guineas. Mr. DE MISSY had another; which wanting a single leaf, he would have supplied the deficiency by transcribing it from Dr. ASKEW's copy, if he had not been prevented by other avocations. When his Library was on sale, this Psalter, being accidentally omitted in the Catalogue, was sold for 6 guineas, without mentioning the circumstance of not being perfect: it was presently returned; and sold afterwards for 2 *l.* 7 *s.*

P. 105. On a blank leaf of Mr. DE MISSY's copy of ALDUS's Septuagint (which was sold to THE BRITISH MUSEUM for 5*l.* 15*s.*) was written, probably by himself, *Hoc exemplar ipsissimum illud est, quod in Catalogo Bibl. Thuanæ hisce verbis designatum: "Biblia Sacra Græca, Fol. Venet.* 1518. *manu "Mich. Hospitalii notata."*

P. 107. The following remarks are alluded to in our account of the first Paris Bible:

"SIR, Cambridge, Jan. 16, 1775.

"The best return I can make, for the pleasure I have "received from your "Origin of Printing," is to com- "municate to you some particulars of the famous Latin "Bible in our Public Library, mentioned by you, p. 106 "and 107. And I will venture to assure you, that the "learned and accurate Dr. TAYLOR was mistaken in what "he has said of it; and PALMER, for once at least, was right.

"In the Cambridge Bible, by holding the leaf up to the "light, there appears to have been three manifest erasures "in the colophon *. So that I make no doubt but that this "is

* The kindness of another Friend has enabled us to give a particular account of these variations, which confirms what is pointed out above:

"The first book printed at Paris has always been supposed to be *Gasparini Pergamiensis Epistolæ*, 1470, (see above, p. 28,) by Michael Friburger, Ulric Gering, and Martin Crantz; which contains this colophon:

"Ut Sol lumen, sic doctrinam fundis in orbem
"Musarum nutrix Regia Parisius.
"Hinc propè divinam, tu, quam Germania novit
"Artem scribendi suscipe promerita.
"*Primos* ecce libros quos hæc industria finxit
"Francorum in terris, ædibus atque tuis.
"Michael, Udalricus, Martinusque Magistri
"Hos impresserunt, ac facient alios."

As express a testimony as this is for fixing the date of printing at Paris in 1470, the colophon you have exhibited in p. 106. confronts it as expressly for the year 1464, and by the same printers. LOUIS XI. began his reign in July 1461. Add two years and a half, or half a lustrum, we come to the year 1464; though some former owner of the book, misled by the false chronology of CHEVILLIER, placing the beginning of LOUIS's reign in 1460, has lettered it on the back 1463. But this date, like some others, has been detected of a forgery, and the book proved to be no other than the edition of 1476 (or, as CHEVILLIER, 1475); which has a long colophon, concluding with these lines:

"Jam tribus Undecimus lustris Francos Lodoicus
"Rexerat, Ulricus, Martinus, itemque Michael;
"Orti Teutoniâ hanc mihi composuere figuram
"Parisii arte sua me correctam vigilanter,
"Venalem in vico Jacobi Sol aureus offert."

In the copy of this Bible at Cambridge, *tribus* has been erased, and *septem* written with a pen in its place; *lustris* is changed into *lustrū*, the last letter

"is the Bible mentioned by CHEVILLIER of 1475. I do not "give you this as any discovery of my own; it was made "many years ago by Mr. MAURICE JOHNSON of Spalding; "and I have been told that Dr. TAYLOR knew and was "convinced of the imposture before he died.

"In the Catalogue of Dr. ASKEW's books to be sold by "auction next month, N° 2064 † and 2622 ‡, are two "books said to be printed by CORSELLIS at Oxford in "1469 and 1470; but the colophon is so bunglingly done "with a pen, that I do not hesitate to pronounce these also "to be impostures.

"Some years ago, OSBORNE announced these books "in one of his Catalogues, which raised the curiosity "of the book-collectors, particularly of those who had "seen ATKYNS's Tract, and who now considered these "books as a confirmation of what he had asserted about the "early printing at Oxford.—They all flocked to Os-"BORNE's shop; who, instead of the books, produced "a letter from a man at Amsterdam, filled with frivolous "excuses for not sending them to him—The Virtuoso were "disappointed, and looked on the whole as a lye; how-

letter being ill connected with the preceding. To carry on the cheat, and set this book at a greater variance from the edition of 1476, the two last lines of the colophon are totally erased, as is easily seen by holding the leaf up to the light; though, the better to conceal the fraud, an ordinary illumination is drawn over the erasure, and a piece of paper pasted on the back of the leaf, to give a better colour to the fraud."

This Bible is, however, certainly a very great curiosity; only two copies of it being known at Paris, one in the King's Library, and the other in that of the Celestines. M. DE BURE mentions, that it has a sort of Supplement, under the title of "Interpretationes Hebraïcorum nominum," printed in three columns, and marked with *signatures*, which do not occur in the body of the book; a circumstance the more remarkable as they were used in 1470 in the *Epistolæ Gasp. Pergamiensis*. N.

† Ger. Listrii Oratio, &c. It was sold for 2 *l.* 3 *s.*

‡ Plinii Epistolæ; which was sold for 1 *l.* 6 *s.*

"ever, they afterwards appeared at an auction at Amster-
"dam, and were bought for Dr. ASKEW—To those who
"are at all conversant in early printing, the dates will ap-
"pear at first sight a bungling forgery.

"I am, &c."

P. 108. *Add*, Besides the copy of SERVETUS, Mr. DE MISSY had several scarce editions of the Latin Bible; one of which, under the title of "Biblia Sacra, Vulgat. Edit. Papæ "Sixti V. *Rom.* 1590," was purchased for THE ROYAL LIBRARY, at the price of 25 *l.* 10 *s.* Two different editions were sold to THE BRITISH MUSEUM; one, "Vulg. Edi-"tionis Clementis Papæ VIII. *Rom.* 1592," for 6 *l.* 15 *s.*; the other, "Vetus Testamentum, Latinè redditum, ex "auctoritate Sixti V. Papæ editum, *Rom.* 1588," for 5 *l.* 5 *s.*

P. 110. l. ult. This *fine copy* was sold for no more than 12 *s.* 6 *d.*

P. 136. l. 3. CHEVILLIER, who does not pretend to enter into the learning or critical abilities of the respective editors, gives the preference to the French Polyglott solely on account of the superior excellence of its types and paper, and of the magnificence which appears through the whole. Dr. WALTON's was printed by THOMAS ROYCROFT.

P. 162. It should have been mentioned, that, in the margin of the concluding paragraph, the following note was written: 'Conf. BODERIANI Dedicationem Editionis Parisiensis Anni '1584. p. xvii. "Philippus Hispaniarum Rex—Plantino— "Bibliorum πενταγλωττων Regio Mandato injunxit. Quod "cùm auditione accepissem, illius tam præclari instituti pro-"movendi causa unà cum fratre meo—eo me contuli."

P. 166. A *fourth* copy of the Bible of 1450 is in the library of the academy at Leipsic.

P. 167. *Three* other copies of the Psalter of 1459 are pointed out by the Writer referred to in our Postscript.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

WHEN this edition was far advanced in the press, an intelligent Correspondent informed us, "that a curious "French book, printed in 1771 at Leipsic, under the title "of *Idée générale d'une Collection complette d'Estampes, avec* "*une Dissertation sur l'Origine de la Gravure et sur les premiers* "*Livres d'Images*, had proved to conviction that cutting "in wood was known before COSTER, and that he had no "claim to the invention."—Not being able at that time to obtain a sight of the book, we supposed the Author might mean no more than, what we have allowed to be of very ancient date, the Chinese method of *engraved tablets*. Having since been favoured with a perusal of the work alluded to, it is but justice to give a short account of it as far as it relates to our subject; and the more so, as it professedly opposes the whole system of Mr. MEERMAN. His attention, as we supposed, is principally employed on ENGRAVINGS *; and, amongst these, the *wooden cuts* in the earliest books appear in a conspicuous light; which leads of course to an investigation of the earliest printers.

The origin of *cutting on wood* is traced by this Author as far back at least as 1423, and is attributed by him to the artists employed in making playing-cards †; who proceeded, from little pictures of saints ‡, to small pieces of history, for the

* The Electoral Gallery at Dresden is accurately described, as the propereſt model for a magnificent collection.

† BULLET, in "Recherches Historiques sur les Cartes à jouer, "*Lyons*, 1757," supposes *cards* to have been first introduced between the years 1375 and 1380. Mr. MEERMAN, who appears to have considered this subject very accurately, allows that they were in use still earlier, namely, before 1367: but will by no means agree that they were then formed from *engravings* of any kind; being only regular pieces of *painted paper*. They are now printed from *blocks*, by an operation different from that of the printing-press, and the court cards are afterwards coloured.

‡ Some of these early essays appear to have been actually used afterwards in that numerous species of books called *Legends*; many of which

 have,

the instruction of youth, and for purposes of devotion. These gave GUTENBERG the hint of cutting *single letters*; a pursuit in which, it is generally allowed, he nearly ruined himself; and in which his failure arose from not being able to form his whole collection precisely of an uniform height. So far this anonymous Author agrees with Mr. MEERMAN; as he also does in the particulars of GUTENBERG's quitting Strasburgh, joining FUST at Mentz, and printing in that partnership DONATUS and some other pieces both on separate *wooden types* and on *wooden blocks*. He allows likewise the merit of inventing matrices to FUST and SCHOEFFER; but totally dissents from the notion suggested by Mr. MEERMAN, that the face of the letters was ever cut on *cast* bodies; attributing the irregularity of appearance in the very early books to the circumstance of some particular types having been more worn than others. How far this opinion will operate against what Mr. MEERMAN has said of the BIBLE of 1450, the PSALTERS, and the CATHOLICON, let the judicious Reader determine.

This Author gives a very satisfactory account of the PSALTERS of 1457 and 1459, formed from an actual examination of *five* copies of the former, and *three* of the latter; and censures the description of DE BURE, as full of errors. The Psalter of 1490, which is supposed to have been printed with the same types when extremely worn, is more scarce than either of the others: M. DE BURE never could meet with a copy of it; and the German Writer never heard but of a single one *. Several of the large *wooden* capitals, which were cut for the *Psalter*, appear to have been used likewise in DURANDUS.

There is a very curious volume of Fables, in small folio, in the Library at Wolfenbuttel, which this Writer

have, at the head of each legend, the figure of a Saint, just of the size of the old playing-cards, and illuminated in the same manner.

* In the library at Elsenach.—See above, p. 93.

thinks

thinks (if the date could be ascertained) might claim the honour of being the first book in which there was a mixture of *wooden pictures* and *separate types*; though it has been usually considered as a work entirely consisting of *wooden blocks*.

A very accurate and entertaining account is given in this work of several books, under the head of "*Premiers Livres* "*gravés en Tables de Bois*." Amongst these are, "La Bible "des Pauvres*;" "L'Histoire de St. Jean et de l'Apo- "calypse†;" "Images des Cantiques‡;" and "Histoire de "la Sainte Vierge‡." These four consist entirely of pictures, without any reading.—Several others are enumerated, with a mixture of pictures and explanations, all on solid blocks of wood; among these, are "Le Livre de l'Anti- "christ;" "Ars memorandi;" "Ars moriendi; "Sujets

* This work has frequently been mistaken for the *Speculum*. A Ms. in the Library at Osnabrug, written so early as 1467, begins an account of the pictures in it with "Incipit Speculum Humane Salvationis." Mr. MEERMAN describes it under the title of "Figuræ typicæ veteris "atque antitypicæ Novi Testamenti, seu Historiæ Jesu Christi in figuris." SCHÖPFLIN calls it, "Vaticinia Veteris Testamenti de Christo." But the appellation of "La Bible des Pauvres" is happily expressive of its original purpose; which was, to render the Scriptures familiar to those who could not possibly pay for transcribing the whole Bible. Dr. ASKEW's copy of this book, which was imperfect, was sold to Dr. HUNTER for 16 pounds.

† An illuminated copy of this work, formerly belonging to the celebrated VUYLENBROECK, was sold by auction at Amsterdam to M. DE BOZE, from whom it passed to the President DE COTTE, from him to the collection of M. DE GAIGNAT; whence it was purchased for HIS BRITANNIC MAJESTY, and is now in THE ROYAL LIBRARY. This copy unfortunately wants the last leaf; but it is illuminated, and is enriched with many Ms. leaves, explaining the several figures, in the German language.—Dr. ASKEW had an imperfect copy of this work, which was bought by Dr. HUNTER for 20 guineas.

‡ Mr. MEERMAN too hastily censures SCHÖPFLIN, for calling these *different* books: which they clearly appear to be. The first of them he himself describes, under the title of "Historia seu Providentia Virginis "Mariæ ex Cantico Canticorum iconice exhibita." A good account of the other is in the Leipsic book, under the title of "Historia beatæ Mariæ "Virginis ex Evangelistis & Patribus excerpta & per figuras demonstrata."

tirés

"tirés de l'Ecriture Sainte;" "Speculum Humanæ Salvá-
"tionis;" and "La Chiromantie du Docteur Hartlieb."

Zealous as this Author is in ascertaining the date of the invention, he is not able to trace the *name* of any earlier Engraver than MICHAEL WOLGEMUT, who was born in 1434, and died in 1519; being totally for exploding LAURENTIUS COSTER, whom he will not allow to have been either an Engraver or a Printer. He cavalierly treats the whole history as a fiction of the Hollanders; and places, in opposition to the positive testimony of ADRIAN JUNIUS, the negative silence of CARL VAN MANDER, an eminent designer, painter, and engraver, who resided at Harleim from 1585 till 1604, when he published an account of the illustrious painters and other artists of Flanders and Holland; and very particularly enumerates the works of some who, according to the chronology of Mr. MEERMAN, must have been the contemporaries of COSTER. It must be acknowledged that the silence of such a Writer (especially as he mentions that Harleim pretended to the honour of the invention) is of some weight; but not sufficient, perhaps, to overthrow the chain of arguments which has been so ably produced by Mr. MEERMAN.

We cannot, however, take our leave of this ingenious Author without lamenting that he has been so little informed of the state of the polite arts in this kingdom. His whole account of "Les Estampes Angloises" is comprized in ten pages; and the article of VERTUE, whose engravings are such an honour to our country, *in four words* *. At the same time it must be acknowledged that, in points which he has had an opportunity of examining, his book appears to be accurate and instructive.

* Dr. ASKEW he has called "Mr. *Askens*;" and the Earl of DERBY "Comte *Jaques Derby*, Sr de *Stanley*, &c." But these are a sort of errors which Foreign Writers frequently commit, and which perhaps we may in similar cases be ourselves too apt to fall into. N.

THE END.

SUPPLEMENT

TO

THE ORIGIN

OF

PRINTING.

1781.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE History of CORSELLIS is so intimately connected with the Origin of Printing in England, that I am happy in being able to lay before the Reader a series of letters which will contribute to the illustration of that disputed subject.

The first in the present collection is from Dr. DUCAREL to Mr. MEERMAN, dated Nov. 21, and a Postscript of Dec. 19, 1760; which were written originally in English, and translated into Latin by the late Dr. MUSGRAVE, who at that time happened to be at Rotterdam as one of Dr. RADCLIFF's Travelling Physicians. This is followed by Mr. MEERMAN's Answer, in French, with a translation, dated Dec. 27, 1760.

The "Second Answer," as it is here called, in Latin, dated Rotterdam, Decemb. 1761, was never communicated to Dr. DUCAREL, who had no knowledge thereof till it appeared in the "Origines Typographicæ, "1765." It would otherwise most probably have been answered.

The Letter on early-printed Books at Harleim is transcribed from the HARLEIAN MSS. and is

followed by two others, relative to ancient Bibles, from the late Chancellor TAYLOR, to the Earl of OXFORD, Dec. 20, 1740, and to Dr. DUCAREL, Nov. 2, 1752.

Some Additional Remarks on the ſubject of the whole volume are added by the Editor, who hopes that they will be agreeable to the perſons who do him the honour of looking into this little work.

July 26, 1781.

DR.

DR. DUCAREL'S LETTER

TO

MR. MEERMAN.

WITH THE DOCTOR'S NOTES.

SIR,

IN the late very agreeable conversation which I had with you, concerning the Origin and first Inventors of Printing, our discourse having sometimes turned upon a story published in 1664, by Richard Atkyns, Esq. [A]; I have since employed some of my leisure hours in sifting that story to the bottom, and take the liberty of sending you the result of my enquiries.

[The substance of the record (which Dr. Ducarel here introduced) has been already given, p. 3—7.]

For this new discovery Atkyns vouches "the copy "of a record and manuscript in Lambeth-house, be- "longing to the see, and not to any particular arch- "bishop of Canterbury, of which a present was made "to him by a most worthy person, in whose custody it

see p. 297

[A] His book is a 4to pamphlet of 24 pages, intitled, "The Original and Growth of Printing, &c." [as mentioned already, p. 2.]

"heretofore was; who alſo put into his hands, *Ex-*
"*poſicio Sancti Jeronimi in Symbolum Apoſtolorum*, pre-
"tended to be printed at Oxford in MCCCCLXVIII [B]."

p. 296

This improbable and groundleſs ſtory was examined and confuted, in 173-, by the late very learned Dr. Conyers Middleton, in his ingenious "Diſſertation "concerning the Origin of Printing in England;" wherein he plainly proves "that it was firſt intro-"duced and practiſed by our countryman *William* "*Caxton*, at Weſtminſter: and not, as is commonly "believed (upon Atkyns' ſole authority), by a foreign "printer at Oxford."

And yet, notwithſtanding, this ſame exploded ſtory hath been lately revived, and vented abroad with a great deal of petulance by one writer [C]; and adopted alſo by another author [D], though indeed more judicious and moderate.

This hath moved me, out of a due regard to truth, to lay before you other arguments, unknown moſtly to Dr. Middleton, to ſhew that what Mr. Atkyns hath

[B] Mr. Ames hath given a ſpecimen of the form of the letter in which this book is printed. Typog. Antiq. p. 437.

[C] Annus Tertius Sæcularis inventæ Artis Typographicæ, ſive Brevis Hiſtorica Enarratio de Inventione Nobiliſſimæ Artis Typographicæ, &c. Auctore Joanne Chriſtiano Seiz. Harlemi, 1742, 8vo. [See above, p. 165.]

[D] Hiſtoire de l'Origine et des premiers progres de l'Imprimerie, A la Haye, 1740, 4to. without a name; but we learn from the laſt mentioned writer, that the Author is Proſper Marchand.

advanced,

advanced, concerning the Lambeth record, is a mere fable.

Mr. Atkyns's words, which I am more particularly to examine, are these: "And the same most *worthy* "*person* who trusted me with the aforesaid book [viz. "Exposicio Sancti Ieronimi, &c.] [E] did also *present* "me with the copy of a *Record and Manuscript* in "Lambeth-house heretofore in his custody, *belonging* "*to the see, and not to any particular archbishop of Can-* "*terbury*; the substance whereof was this (though I "hope for publique satisfaction the Record itself, in "its due time, will appear)."

Had Atkyns informed us who that *worthy person* was, we might even at this time have discovered whether he had been Secretary or Librarian at Lambeth; but he is silent not only as to the name and employment of the person, but likewise as to the time when he first received the copy of this pretended Record. And it is very strange, that *worthy person* should present his

[E] It is very material to observe, that there is no name of printer to this book. "One Frederick Corsellis, as the in-"genious Mr. Ames remarks, has been contrived for that "honour [of printing this book]; who, so far as I have ob-"served, never printed any book either here or elsewhere, "his name being never found as printer to any antient book "whatsoever." Typog. Antiq. p. 437.

I have examined Mr. TUTET's copy of this very curious book, which is a small quarto, in quaternions of 16 pages, and has the following colophon: "Explicit exposicio sancti "Ieronimi in simbolo apostolorum ad papam laurēcium. "Impressa Oxonie Et finita Anno domini M.cccc.lxviii. "xvii die decembris." See hereafter, p. 296. N.

friend Atkyns with a copy only, and not with an *Exemplification* of ſuch a remarkable Record *in his cuſtody*; which *Exemplification* ought to have contained not only the *dates of the Ricord*, but likewiſe the *name of the Manuſcript* from whence he had taken this extraordinary ſtory. It ſhould likewiſe have been *ſigned by the Donor*, in order to eſtabliſh this fact, and thereby make it an authentic evidence to poſterity.

His next words are, *Record and Manuſcript*; a ſtrange expreſſion! A Record ſignifies an authentic and uncontrolable teſtimony in writing, contained in rolls of parchment. Of theſe the Lambeth Library contains an infinite number, from the earlieſt times to the preſent. The *Regiſter Books* of the archbiſhops of Canterbury have time out of mind been deemed *Records*, and ever received as ſuch in all the courts of juſtice of this kingdom. And it is very well known, that all Charters, Records, Rolls, Archives, Manuſcripts, Books, &c. &c. belonging to the ſee of Canterbury, are (what is called in our laws) *Heir-Looms* [F] of that ſee, and as ſuch do not belong to any particular *archbiſhop*, but deſcend by ſucceſſion from one to another.

This affected and unuſual expreſſion of Atkyns ſeems intended to cover his deſign, which was to get an excluſive privilege of printing, and thereby a good and profitable patent place [G].

If

[F] This word is derived from the Saxon words Heire, i. e. *Hæres*, and Leame *Membrum*.

[G] To explain this, it may not here be improper to give ſome account of Atkyns.—Richard Atkyns was of a good family

If Atkyns meant, that there was any manuſcript preſerved in the Lambeth Library, containing the fine tale he hath amuſed us with; the anſwer is, that I am very ſure, after a thorough ſearch and examination, that no ſuch Record and Manuſcript is at preſent to —

family in Glouceſterſhire, born in 1615, went to Baliol College in Oxford in 1629, where he was a Gentleman Commoner; was afterwards awhile in Lincoln's-Inn, and travelled to France with a young nobleman. At his return he frequented the court. In the civil wars he raiſed a troop of horſe for the king at his own charge, and did him good ſervice; for which he ſuffered much in his eſtate. After the Reſtoration, he was a deputy lieutenant of Glouceſterſhire. Having been at the expence of above a thouſand pounds in chancery and other law-courts for near 24 years, to prove the right of the king's grant in printing law-books, he had ſome hope of repairing his fortune by his writings; and publiſhed his *Original and Growth of Printing in England*, in 4to. 1664. Five years after, he publiſhed his Vindication, &c. containing a relation of ſeveral paſſages in the Weſtern wars of England, wherein he was concerned. To which are added his Sighs and Ejaculations, 4to. 1669. He was married, but it ſeems unfortunately; for it is ſaid, that towards his latter end it proved his ruin. He died a priſoner for debt in the Marſhalſea, 14 Sept. 1677, and was buried in St. George's Church Southwark, by the appointment of Sir Richard Atkyns, Juſtice of the Common Pleas, and Edward afterwards Baron Atkyns, his relations. See Atkyns Antiq. of Glouceſterſhire; and, if you deſire to know what has been written on this ſubject, ſee alſo Biographia Britannica, Vol. I. fol. London, 1747. p. 255, 256; alſo Vol. II. fol. London, 1748. p. 872. 1226, 1227, 1228.

be

be found there. But if by the word *Manuſcript* he means archbiſhop Bourgchier's [H] Regiſter, it becomes neceſſary to give you ſome account of that.

The Regiſter Book of archbiſhop *Bourgchier*, in two volumes folio, is a very large and fair vellum manuſcript, preſerved (among the other Archiepiſcopal Regiſters of the ſee of Canterbury) in the Manuſcript Library at Lambeth. It is in my cuſtody as Librarian, and is called Bourgchier. It is written in a very ſmall but neat character, and contains 161 folios, numbered on one ſide only. The firſt inſtrument in this Regiſter is dated 10 Die Oct. A. D. 1454. The laſt inſtrument bears date 25 Die Mart. A. D. 1486, i. e. five days before Abp. Bourgchier's death.

This is an account of the firſt volume.

The ſecond volume of this Regiſter Book (on vellum, and of the ſame ſize as the former) is commonly called *Morton*, *Dene*, *Bourgchier*, and *Courteneye*. It contains only ſeven leaves relating to acts done by Abp. *Bourgchier*, viz. from 29 Die Junii, A. D. 1479, to 10 Die Oct. 1485. This, when quoted, is called Bourgchier pars 2da.

[H] The Regiſter Books of all the Archbiſhops of Canterbury, from A. D. 1279, to the preſent time (except thoſe of Archbiſhops Mepeham, Stratford, and Bradwardine, i. e. from A. D. 1328 to 1349, long ſince loſt) are extant, and carefully preſerved in the Manuſcript Library at Lambeth Palace. They are all fair vellum manuſcripts, in fine condition, and very legible. When quoted by any author, they are called by the name of their reſpective Archbiſhops.

In

In theſe two Regiſter Books, I take upon me to affirm, that there is no mention whatſoever made, directly or indirectly, either of the Art of Printing, or of Frederick Corſellis. And I am enabled to aſſert this very poſitively, having myſelf drawn up (for the uſe of the ſee of Canterbury) an Alphabetical Index and Abſtract of every inſtrument contained in the Regiſter Books of this archbiſhop (as well as thoſe of his predeceſſors, from A. D. 1279, and of his ſucceſſors to 1757); and, having likewiſe ſince the receipt of your letter carefully compared my ſaid Abſtract and Index with Abp. Bourgchier's two Regiſters, can aſſure you, Sir, that there is nothing contained in either of them relative to Printing in the ſaid archbiſhop's time.

Moreover, Sir, in order to endeavour to find out the truth of this matter, I have carefully examined a very valuable book belonging to the Manuſcript Library at Lambeth. It is entitled, *Matthæi Parker Cantuarienſis Archiepiſcopi de Antiquitate Britannicæ Eccleſiæ, & privilegiis Eccleſiæ Cantuarienſis cum Archiepiſcopis ejuſdem* LXX. printed at London, by John Day, 1572. Of this book there are three editions [I] in folio, but this of 1572 is ſo extremely ſcarce, that (except our Lambeth copy) there are not known to be above two or three copies extant in any Library in this kingdom that are complete. But what renders our copy in-

[I] Viz. This edition of 1572, one printed at Hanaw in 1605, and a third publiſhed at London, by Dr. Samuel Drake, in 1729.

eſtimable,

eſtimable, is a very great number of manuſcript notes diſperſed throughout that book in almoſt every page; which notes are of the handwriting of Archbiſhop Parker (whoſe book it was), George Acworth LL. D. and John Joſelyn, his Grace's ſecretary, who were employed by the ſaid moſt Reverend Archbiſhop, in his palace at Lambeth, to aſſiſt him in compiling that excellent work.

This copy (in the Life of Archbiſhop Bourgchier) has the following account of the Introduction of the Art of Printing. "His temporibus, (viz. Tho. "Bourgchier) illa utiliſſima cudendi atque impri-"mendi ſcientia Argentorati, Germaniæ civitate, in-"venta eſt, etſi de Authoris, loci Annique certa ve-"ritate inter ſcriptores magna diſſentio eſt, quam per-"pendant lectores." Page 335.

It is very remarkable, that the only additional manuſcript notes added to the life of Abp. Bourgchier, in the Lambeth copy, are in the very page where the above quotation is; which manuſcript notes contain nothing more than the pedigree of the ſaid archbiſhop, and a ſhort obſervation added below [K]; ſo that it is certain, that the ſtory of Corſellis was unknown at that time; and it is very evident, that archbiſhop Parker, and the compilers of his book, had before them archbiſhop Bourgchier's Regiſter, from their quoting (towards the end of his life) Regiſtr. Tho. Bourchier,

[K] "Anno 1464. Reformatio magna multorum Mona-"ſteriorum in diverſis Mundi partibus fit, ut in *Faſciculo* "*Temporum*." Page 335.

part

part 2d. f. 177. I know this argument, of Archbishop Parker's mentioning Strasburg on this occasion, is made use of by Dr. Middleton; but, as in all probability the Doctor had never seen our Lambeth copy of this book, I thought it necessary to take notice of it.

On this occasion, Sir, the Harleian Manuscripts in the *British Museum* have been searched; and Mr. John Bagford's [L] large Collections towards a Ge-

[L] John Bagford, the antiquary and great collector of old English books, prints, &c. was born in London. He had been in his younger days a shoe-maker, afterwards a bookseller; and lastly, for the many curiosities wherewith he enriched the famous library of Dr. John Moore, bishop of Ely, his lordship got him admitted into the Charter-House. He was several times in Holland, and in other foreign parts, where he procured many valuable old books, prints, &c. some of which he disposed of to the late earl of Oxford, who, after his death, purchased all his collections, papers, &c. for his library. In 1707, were published, in the Philosophical Transactions, his proposals for a General History of Printing. See an account of his Entries, which were designed for a General History of Printing, in the Catalogue of the Harleian Collection of MSS. purchased by authority of parliament for the use of the public, and preserved in the British Museum, vol. II. fol. London, 1759, from N° 5892 to N° 5910. He died May 5, 1716, aged 65 years; and twelve years after, a print was engraved of him, from a painting of Mr. Howard, by George Vertue. [Some of these particulars have been already taken notice of, p. 164. N.]

neral History of Printing consulted. Mr. Bagford, in Manuscript, N° 5901, (entitled, *A Book in Folio, shewing the Progress of Printing at Oxford*), cites Atkyns's Pamphlet, for an account of Archbishop Bourgchier's bringing printing into England, and mentions Frederick Corsellis; and adds, "Although "some have greatly doubted of the certainty of "this manuscript [so he calls Atkyns's Record and "Manuscript], yet I am very well assured, that an "authentic copy was for some time in the hands of "Sir John Birkenhead, when he was chairman to "the committee for regulating of printing, Anno "1664; and I am persuaded, the original may be "still remaining in one of the Register Books of the "same Archbishop Bourchier." In answer to that, *The Journals of the House of Commons*, lately published by authority in twenty-one volumes, folio, have been examined; and upon a careful perusal of those Journals, for the year 1664, and for some time before, as well as after that, there is not found the least mention of the Record in question [M]. Sir John Birkenhead's name occurs indeed sometimes, and particularly in the following words: "27 October, An "Act for continuance of a former Act for regulating "the Press. Sir John Birkenhead is to carry up the "Bill to the Lords for their concurrence," p. 622. But that is nothing to our purpose. As to what

[M] See this circumstance accounted for, p. 17, 18. N.

Bagford

Bagford says concerning Archbishop Bourgchier's Register Books, that is fully answered before.

After a fruitless search into all the Registers, Records, Manuscripts, &c. that I could think of, I have reason to believe, that the name of Corsellis, or Corsells, was unknown in this kingdom till about the middle of the last century, at which time [N] (i. e. between 1655 and 1660) Nicholas Corsellis of London, merchant [O], purchased a considerable estate of Sir Horatio Townsend at Wivenhoe, in the county of Essex, in whose descendents it continues to this

[N] See Newcourt's Repertorium, vol. II. p. 673.—Nicolas Corsellis kept a court at Wivenhoe 16 Dec. 1657, MS. Collect.

[O] I hereunder send you a copy of this gentleman's pedigree, signed by himself in 1664, and taken from the original remaining in the Heralds Office. [He died in 1665. See N. Salmon's Hist. of Essex, p. 448. where the pedigree of that family is continued to 1740.]

The Visitation of London,

By Sir EDWARD BYSSHE CLARENCEUX King of Arms, fol. 38.

Anno 1664.

Zeagan Corcellis of Ruffelin in Flanders. = Joyce Daughter of .... Van Acker of Antwerp.

Nicholas Corcellis of London Merchant, 1664 = Susan Daughter and Coheir of Peter Balde of Leyden in Holland Merchant.

Nich. Corcellis married Martha Daughter of Maurice Thompson. | James Son and Heir = ... Daughter of Peter Fountain of London Merchant.

Nicholas. | Nicholas Corsellis.

day. Nicholas Corſellis, Eſq; is the preſent owner of Wivenhoe. The reſidence of the family is there in a very pleaſant ſeat; but their burial-place is at Layer Marney in the county of Eſſex, where they have another good eſtate.

In the chancel of Layer Marney Church ſtands a mural monument, with a very bad Latin epitaph, and four extremely bad verſes, printed in N. Salmon's Hiſt. of Eſſex, p. 449, as follows: viz.

Præmiſſus non Amiſſus [P].
Nicolaus Corſellis armiger
Dn^s hujus Manerii
Hic requieſcit
Ab hâc vitâ ad meliorem
Commigratus
An° D^ni 1674
Die Octobris 19°
Ætatis 40.

Artem Typographi miratam Belgicus Anglis
Corſellis docuit, Regis prece, munere victus.
Hic fuit extremis Mercator cognitus Indis,
Incola jam coelis: virtus ſua famaque vivent.
Johes Corſellis, ejus Conſanguineus
Et Executor, hoc monumentum poſuit.

The arms on this monument are, Azure a Gryphon Segreant, Or; Creſt, a Demi Gryphon, collar'd, azure.

[P] In alluſion to the laſt words of Seneca's Epiſtle 63, "quem putamus periiſſe, præmiſſus eſt." N.

N. Salmon

N. Salmon has this remark, "The date of this "epitaph is inconſiſtent with the time that Printing "was brought into England, which was 1474, and "ſeems founded on the report Richard Atkyns, Eſq; "had ſpread in his fictitious Original and Growth "of Printing, publiſhed 1664."

I think this epitaph could be founded upon nothing elſe. It ſeems intended to deceive poſterity. And is it not very ſurprizing that this gentleman's father, who gave-in his own pedigree at the Heralds Office in 1664 (the very year that Atkyns's pamphlet was publiſhed), who was then in advanced years, as appears by his original ſignature, ſhould not at that very time inſert therein ſomething of this Frederick Corſellis, if he had had any tradition in his family, of being deſcended from one of the firſt printers in Europe?

Permit me, Sir, to add theſe two other arguments to prove, that Corſellis was not known, before Atkyns's invention in 1664, to have been the firſt printer, either at Oxford or in England; and ſince that time hath not been acknowledged as ſuch, in the moſt ſolemn debates, and after the cloſeſt examination.

In the year 1642, the printers of London preſented a petition to the Houſe of Commons, for the better regulating the Art of Printing, and the calling-in ſeveral Patents for the ſame. A committee was appointed to hear by counſel both the printers and the patentees. Mr. Prynne was counſel for the former;

former; and his notes [Q] (all of his own handwriting) are ſtill extant in the Inner-Temple Library. He begins by mentioning the patents againſt which his clients had petitioned, and then ſays, "Before I fall "upon theſe particular Patents in their order, I "ſhall, by way of neceſſary introduction, give you a "brief touch of the Original Invention of Printing, "and of its firſt introduction into this kingdom, "and rather becauſe there was ſome miſtake herein "in the counſel on the other ſide." After quoting ſeveral authors who had writ on the Invention of Printing, he ſays,—"From theſe various authorities I "collect, that the Art of Printing was firſt invented "in Germany about the year of our Lord 1440, "and began to be known and exerciſed in the "world about Anno 1450." And a little farther, "When and by whom Printing came firſt into Eng-"land, ſhall be my next enquiry." He then quotes the Statute of the firſt of Rich. III. c. 9. and adds, "The firſt printer I meet with in our realm was "William Caxton, who printed *Memorare Noviſ-"ſima*, &c." By which it appears, that the ſtory which was afterwards trumpt up by Atkyns, concerning Frederick Corſellis, was not then known. For if it had, the counſel for the patentees would certainly have mentioned it; and Mr. Prynne would as cer-

[Q] Which notes I have examined on this occaſion, and are thus intituled, "Reports of ſeveral Caſes and Arguments "in Law," all of Mr. William Prynne's own handwriting.

tainly

tainly have ſaid ſomething in anſwer to it. On the contrary he aſſerts, that the Art of Printing, even in its riſe and infancy, was not reputed or uſed by the kings of England, as a thing peculiar to their diſpoſal, by virtue of their prerogative. But what the miſtake was, which he ſays the patentees counſel had made, I cannot find out.

Again, about three years ago [R], there came on, in the Court of King's Bench, a great cauſe between the king's printer and the univerſity of Cambridge, in relation to the former's pretending to an excluſive right to print Law Books. This cauſe was very ſolemnly debated: and as no argument, that could be made uſe of, was omitted on either ſide; ſo the ſtory of Corſellis was made part of the plea on behalf of the king's printer, but ſcouted by the Court [S], as deſtitute

[R] The opinion of the Court of King's Bench was dated Nov. 24, 1758. The Caſe was argued Michaelmas, 31 Geo. II. See the Argument of Mr. Yorke, then Solicitor General, in Burn's Eccleſ. Law, Title COLLEGES. N.

[S] Or rather by Mr. Yorke; who ſeems, however, to have founded his judgement entirely on Dr. Middleton. The Reader ſhall judge. "Were the fiction true of "Hen. VI. and Abp. Bourchier bringing over Frederick "Corſellis, a foreign printer, to ſet up a preſs at Oxford; "ſtill it would not follow, that, becauſe a wiſe prince ge-"nerouſly patronizes a new invention, highly uſeful to man-"kind, and ſpreads it through his kingdom for the good of his "ſubjects, therefore the common law at once ſtamps it with "indelible characters of prerogative, and appropriates it to "the

deſtitute of any proof except that given by Atkyns: and the univerſity's right of printing Law-books was fully confirmed.

Upon the whole therefore, Sir, whatever Antony Wood, Palmer, Bagford, or any other authors ſubſequent to Atkyns, have ſaid concerning Corſellis, can have no weight in this caſe. They all copied the ſtory from Atkyns, upon whoſe ſole credit it reſts. Now Atkyns had a view in impoſing upon mankind; it was his intereſt ſo to do, in order to get a beneficial patent-place under the government [T]. And,

" the king and his ſucceſſors, in right of his crown. But " that fiction received by Maittaire, Palmer, and other " eminent writers on the Hiſtory of Printing, is now fully " expoſed in Dr. Middleton's Diſſertation on the Origin of " Printing in England, to the ſatisfaction of the learned " world."—With the profoundeſt veneration for this admirable Pleader, we may be allowed to obſerve, from another part of his argument, " that the power of the crown was not in queſtion; both parties admitted it; both parties claimed under it." Whatever private views might be indulged by Atkyns, the queſtion is now debated on a much more liberal idea. And thoſe who even doubt of the exiſtence of Corſellis, may at leaſt admit that ſome very probable arguments have been ſuggeſted ~~in his ſupport~~ to establish it. See the note K, p. 17, et ſeq. N.

[T] " Colonel Atkyns (the then patentee) contended with " ſeveral members of the ſtationers company, for the printing " of lord Rolle's Abridgement: and, in defence of his pa- " tent, in the year 1664, publiſhed a diſcourſe to ſhew (as " the title-page expreſſes) that printing belongs to the pre-

And, since this pretended Record was never known in former, nor produced in later times, I cannot believe there ever was such a printer in this kingdom as Frederick Corsellis, and look upon the whole story as a mere fable.

Be

"rogative royal, and is a flower of the crown. That book "proves that he deserves the character given him by Dr. "Middleton, of *a bold vain man*; and as he was the first "editor, so some have imputed to him the honour of in-"venting that fiction about Henry VI. and the archbishop "of Canterbury, and the record at Lambeth pretended in "support of it, which the most accurate enquirers could "never find. If his interest provoked him to this excess, "still his principles and his record, though they infected "the argument of his counsel in the house of lords (as ap-"pears by Carter's Reports 89.) did not impose upon the "judgement of this court, as grounds of prerogative at com-"mon law: for the court of king's bench (lord chief justice "Hale presiding) were of opinion against the validity of his "patent: The name of the case was *Roper* v. *Streater*. "It is remarkable, that there is not a note of the debate at "the bar, or of the opinion of the court, in any printed "report of that time; only the argument of counsel, in "support of the patent, which I just now mentioned. Per-"haps the anxiety or prudence of some former law-patentee "made him unwilling to publish it." YORKE.—Our readers will not be displeased with one more quotation from this learned and excellent Lawyer: "The first printers exercised the "art, without any privilege, general or special. Caxton, to "whom the honour of importing the art into England is "clearly due, obtained no patent for this purpose. Though

Be so good as to excuse the length of this letter, and permit me to assure you, that I have the honour to remain, with the greatest esteem, Sir,

Your most obedient humble servant,

London,
Nov. 21, 1760.

AND. COLTEE DUCAREL.

"favoured and protected by Edward IV. ~~Henry II.~~ VI the "duke of Clarence, and others, there is no pretence for the "notion, that he was either a grantee or servant of the "Crown. In the large number of volumes which he "printed, he never mentions it. His title-page never bears "*cum privilegio*, or *cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum*: "only these humble words, *Imprinted by me simple man*, "*William Caxton*. If he had been a grantee or servant of "the crown, he would have referred to his letters patent, or "styled himself *Printer to the King's grace*, as others did af-"terwards*. If such a licence or authority had been "deemed necessary, the great lawyers of that age would "have told him so. He might have advised upon it with "Lyttleton himself. And not only his merit would have "procured it, but his modesty would have sought it for his "protection." See Burn, ubi supra. N.

* The earliest letters patent were granted, 1 Ed. VI. to *Richard Grafton*, with a fee of 12d. a year, and a reversionary grant of 4l. after the death of *Thomas Bertlett*, late printer to king *Henry* VIII.—On the surrender of *Grafton*, the office, 1 *Mary*, came to *Cawood*; to whom, with *R. Jugge*, it was granted, 1 *Eliz.*—To *Christopher Barker*, 19 *Eliz.*—To *Robert Barker*, 31 *Eliz.*—To *Christopher Barker*, 1 *James.*—To *Robert Barker*, 14 *James.*—To *Bonham Norton* and *John Bill*, 3 *Charles.*—To *Charles Barker* and *Matthew Barker*, 11 *Charles.*—To *Thomas Newcombe* and *H. Hills*, 27 *Charles* II.—To *Benjamin Tooke* and *John Barber*, 12 *Anne*, [by the particular friendship of the earl of *Oxford*, as appears by Swift's Works, vol. XVII. p. 533.] for a term of 30 years; and from these, by various assignments, the estate and interest became vested in *John Basket*, the father of the plaintiff in the cause then depending.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

To the many cheats about the dates of editions, related by the author of *L'Histoire de l'Origine et des Premiers Progres de l'Imprimerie*, part. I. p. 108, &c. and by Mr. Joseph Ames, in his *Typographical Antiquities*, p. 438. I shall beg leave to add these two [U].

1. In the library of the late Thomas Earl of Pembroke, is a book without a title-page, as was common in the oldest editions, but beginning abruptly with the *subject* itself; only at the end of it are these words;

Explicit liber Quartus
Dyalogorꝫ Gregorii.

Then follows in red letters,

Præsens hoc Op^s^ factum est per Johan
Guttenbergium apud Argentinam
Anno millesimo cccclviii.

The earl of Pembroke has writ in the beginning of the above book as follows: "I bought this "book because it is printed before they made use "of matrices to cast single letters; from the varia-"tion of the shapes of the same letters it appears, "that they were wooden moveable types; as for the "red, I told the man, that I believed there was some "cheat in it, because I had some months before such "a book, printed without the red, brought to me

[U] See those taken notice of, p. 21. and 171. N.

"by another person, who asked me more for it "than I cared to give. The paper has the Bull's "head, on which Faust, &c. printed, and is "reckoned to be older than any dated by Faust, "and so older than the date here in red." In a copy of Palmer's History of Printing, belonging to Mr. Tutet, Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, Mr. Ames, whose book it had been, has added a manuscript note, in which he asserts, that the subscription beginning *Presens hoc Op. &c.* was printed by Palmer himself [X] to get money, as he was informed by one of Palmer's executors; which assertion the late Mr. Ames often confirmed in conversation to Mr. Tutet, who purchased this book of him in his life-time; and from the said Mr. Tutet I have this information.

2. In Thomas Osborne's Catalogue of Books on Sale for the year 1756, the following book is mentioned in the third volume, N° 1345: "Plinii Secundi "Epistolarum liber primus. Exemplar elegans, li-"teris initial. colorat. corio turcico fol. deaur. lineis "rubris, et auro elegant. ornat. Oxon. apud F. "Corsellis, 1469." £15. 15*s*. To which is added this note, "Hocce unicum est exemplar notum, a "variis allegatum, et vix uni visum, adeo ut Phœnix "librorum dici mereatur; certe primus est, ex libris "a Corsellis impressis, cui nomen suum adjunxerit; "Secundus vero ordine omnium quos unquam ille

[X] A similar instance of Palmer's disingenuity has been already exhibited in p. vi.—He died in May, 1732. N.

 "impressit:

"impressit: priorem scilicet scimus fuisse *Jeronymi* "*Expositionem in Symbol. Apostolor.* Oxoniæ, 1468. "Anno 1470, varia idem typographus impressit "opuscula, addito in fine nomine, sed nec unicum "eorum reperitur hodie integrum. Possident quidem "amatores fragmenta aliqua poematum Latinorum, "ut *Gerardi Lystrii Rhenensis*, &c. *Carmen Lystrii* "*Luidorum hominum venenosas linguas*, &c."

You are so well acquainted with the artifice used about this last, by some on your side of the water [Y], that I need make no observations upon it [Z].

London,
Dec. 14, 1760.

A. C. D.

[Y] Meaning the late Hon. Justice, who was transported for seven years for stealing some books out of the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, and who resided at the Hague in 1756.

[Z] Mr. Meerman, in a note on this passage, points out a detection of a like imposition in "Liber Helwici de ex-"emplis & similitudinibus rerum;" said to have been printed "in Monasterio Sublacensi, 1464;" and for which he gave 205 florins. N.

TRANSLA-

MR. MEERMAN'S ANSWER

TO

DR. DUCAREL.

MONSIEUR,

J'AI été charmé de reçevoir votre agréable Lettre accompagnée de la belle Dissertation Epistolaire sur Frederick Corsellis, que j'ai lue avec un veritable plaisir, et vous sçai très bon grè pour la peine que vous vous êtes donné de faire tant de recherches pour les rassembler. Je trouve qu'elle est fort digne de voir le jour. Je la ferai donc traduire en Latin, pour accompagner ma Dissertation, qui ne pourra etre mise sous presse, que vers le printems ou l'été prochain. Mon intention étoit de revoquer en doute les prétensions de Harlem, qui ont été fort mal appuyées jusqu'à present: mais j'ai fait tant de nouvelles découvertes, qui m'ont fait changer de sentiment. En effet il me paroit fort clair, qu'on a trouvé à Harlem l'Art d'imprimer en types de bois mobiles, et qu'on les a changés à Mayence en types de metal premierement sculptés, ensuite fondus. J'ai découvert

TRANSLATION

OF

MR. MEERMAN'S ANSWER.

SIR,

I WAS delighted on receiving your agreeable Letter, accompanied with your excellent Epiſtolary Diſſertation on the ſubject of Frederick Corſellis. I peruſed it with great pleaſure, and am extremely obliged to you for the pains you have taken to collect together the many reſearches you have made. I eſteem it worthy to be publiſhed; and therefore ſhall tranſlate it into Latin, to accompany my Diſſertation, which cannot be ſent to the preſs till next ſpring or ſummer. My intention was to call in queſtion the Harleim pretenſions, which hitherto have been very ill ſupported; but I have made ſo many new diſcoveries, that I am obliged to change my opinion. Indeed it ſeems evident to me, that the Art of Printing with moveable wooden types was firſt diſcovered at Harleim; and that at Mentz they changed it into types of metal firſt graved or ſcuptured, and afterwards caſt. I am the firſt

that

couvert le premier, par des documens authentiques, qu'il y a eu deux *Johannes Gensefleisch*, un le vieux qui à été le valet de Laurent Coster, et qui a découvert quelque chose de l'art à *Johannes Gensefleisch le jeune*, autrement dit Guttenberg. Celui-ci a commencé à faire des tentatives de l'art à Strasbourg des l'an 1436 (comme il paroit par les pieces publiées l'année passée par Monsieur Schopflin), mais il n'en a jamais pu venir à bout, comme je prouverai contre ce sçavant de Strasbourg. Or Laurent Coster étant mort à Harlem vers l'an 1440, son valet Gensefleisch le vieux s'est retiré clandestinement de Harlem, et s'est établi à Mayence, où il a commencé à perfectioner l'art, et l'autre *Gensefleisch le jeune*, dit Guttenberg, l'a suivi à Mayence l'an 1445. Tous les sçavans, même Monsieur Schopflin, ont confondu ces deux personnes; mais je prouverai et par leur distinction du vieux et jeune, et par leurs differentes femmes, et differente demeure jusqu'à l'an 1444 inclus, que ce sont deux differentes personnes, qui ont donné occasion à tant de disputes entre les sçavants. Je montrerai ensuite, qu'ils sont de la famille de Gensefleisch (qui étoit connue pour noble à Mayence) de la même tige qui a pris le nom de Guttenberg, pour se distinguer de la branche de Gensefleisch de Sorgenloh; et qu'il est plus que probable, qu'ils ont été freres, puisqu'il etoit d'usage dans ce tems, que dans les familles, ou il y avoit beaucoup d'enfans,

on

that has discovered, by authentic documents, that there were two *Johannes Gensefleische*; one, the eldest, was servant or workman to Laurence Coster, and discovered somewhat of the art to the youngest Johannes Gensefleische, otherwise surnamed Guttenberg. This latter began to make trials of the art at Strasbourgh anno 1436 (as appears by original pieces published last year by professor Schöpflin); but he never could perfect it, as I will prove against the said learned professor of Strasbourg's opinion. Now, as Laurence Coster died at Harleim about 1440, his servant Gensefleische senior retired clandestinely from Harleim, and established himself at Mentz, where he began to bring the art to perfection; and the other Gensefleische the junior, or Guttenberg, followed him to Mentz about 1445. All the learned, even Mr. Schöpflin, have confounded these two persons together; but I will prove, not only by their distinction of senior and junior, but by their different wives, and by their different dwellings till the year 1444 included, that they are two different persons, and which indeed has occasioned so much controversy among the learned. I shall afterward shew; that they are of the Gensefleische family (a family allowed for noble at Mentz), and of the same branch which took the surname of Guttenberg, to distinguish itself from the branch of Gensefleische of Sorgenloh; and that it is more than probable that they were brothers, since it was a custom in those times, that, in the families which had many chil-

acknowledg

on donnoit le même prénom à deux fils, qui se distinguoient en ajoutant le *vieux* et le *jeune*, donc j'alleguerai des exemples. Voici donc deux freres, dont l'un étoit le valet dans la Typographie à Harlem, et qui a decouvert l'art à l'autre frere, et s'est retiré apres à Mayence. Ceci, ayant été enseveli dans l'oubli et ignoré de tous les sçavans depuis peut-etre 250 ans, sera developé tant par des documens authentiques, que par des témoignages des autheurs avant 1500, qui seront collationés ensemble. Lisez à present, Monsieur, ce qui est dit dans le manuscript chez Atkyns *de ces deux freres* [S], et dites moi ensuite, s'il est possible, que cet homme a pu fabriquer de sa tete une chose, que tout le monde ignoroit dans son tems, et qui est pourtant vraye? Je crois donc de bonne foi, qu'il y a eu veritablement un tel manuscript, soit au Lambeth House, soit ailleurs. N'a-t-on pas pu le prêter a quelqu'un qui a negligé de le rendre? Bagford a dit, que la copie authentique a été entre les mains de Monsieur Birkenhead, lorsqu'il etoit Committé du Parlement pour regler une affaire de l'imprimerie en 1664. On trouve effectivement ce Committé marqué le 27 Octob. 1664,

[S] The passage alluded to by Mr. Meerman from Atkyns is this: "So that at Oxford printing was first set up in England, which was before there was any printing-press or printer in France, Spain, Italy, or Germany (except the city of Mentz), which claims seniority, as to printing, even of Harleim itself, calling her city, *Urbem Moguntinum* "*Artis*

dren, they gave the same Christian name to two sons, who were only distinguished by adding senior or junior, of which I shall alledge examples. Here then were two brothers, one of whom was servant or workman in the Printing-house at Harleim, and who discovered the art to the other brother, and afterwards retired to Mentz. This, though sunk into oblivion, and unknown to all the learned for perhaps 250 years, shall be now brought to light, not only by authentic documents, but also by the testimonies of authors before the year 1500, which shall be collated together. Read now, Sir, what is said in the manuscript cited by Atkyns of these two brothers [S]; then tell me if it is possible he could invent such a thing which all the world in his time was ignorant of, but which is nevertheless a real truth? I earnestly believe then that there was really such a manuscript, either at Lambeth Palace, or elsewhere. Might it not have been lent, and never returned again? Bagford says, that the authentic copy was in the hands of Mr. Birkenhead, when he was of the Parliamentary Committee to settle or regulate an affair of printing in 1664. This Committee is absolutely found in the Journals of the House of Commons on the 27 Oct. 1664. You do

incarnest

" *Artis Typographicæ Inventricem primam*, though it is " known to be otherwise; that city gaining that art by the " brother of one of the workmen of Harleim, who had learnt " it at home of his brother, and after set up for himself " at Mentz." [See above, p. 5. N.]

1664, dans les Actes de la Chambre basse. Vous ne marquez pas, si jamais il en a été fait raport. Et quand même ce raport s'y trouveroit, il n'etoit nullement nécessaire d'inserer dans le Journal la piece en question, qui peut-etre n'avoit pas la plus grande relation avec le sujet du raport. Aussi je suis informé, qu'en Angleterre il n'est pas d'usage, que les pieces, sur lesquelles un raporteur se fonde, soyent inserées dans le Journal. Il en est de même chez nous. Tous les ans nous recevons deux volumes in folio des Resolutions des Etats d'Hollande. On y insere les raports, mais non les pieces qui ont été examinées dans le Committé, excepté dans quelque affaire de la derniere importance; sans quoi nos Journaux seroient deux ou trois fois plus étendus. Je trouve donc, que le témoignage de Monsieur Bagford prouve, que ce manuscript à été au monde, quand même sa conjecture seroit fausse, que l'original existoit à Lambeth House, ce qu'il ne dit pas positivement. Voici encore une preuve, de ce qui est dit dans ce manuscript touchant l'imprimerie d'Oxford avant celle de Londres. C'est un témoignage de Monsieur Brian Twynus [T], in

[T] The passage of Brian Twyne is this; "Artem "typographicam Angliæ finibus recenter appulsam, "Oxoniam primò devenisse, undè Gulielmi Caxtoni "opera Londinum quoque traductam esse, non solum an-"tiqua scripta referunt, sed etiam illud indicat, quod Jo. "Scolar primus Oxoniensis typographus, officinam typo-"graphicam

not tell me if a report of it was ever made; and even though ſuch report ſhould be found, it would not be neceſſary to inſert in the Journals the piece now in queſtion, which perhaps might not have been of ſuch great conſequence to the ſubject then on hand. I am alſo informed, that in England it is not cuſtomary to inſert the papers in the Journals upon which they make report. Every year we receive two volumes in folio of the reſolutions of the States of Holland: they inſert the reports in them, but not the papers, or pieces, which were examined in the Committee, except in an affair of the utmoſt importance, without which method our Journals would be twice or thrice more voluminous. I therefore find that Mr. Bagford's teſtimony proves that this manuſcript really exiſted, even though his conjecture of its being at Lambeth Palace was erroneous, which however he does not poſitively aſſert. Another proof of what is related in the ſaid manuſcript, about printing at Oxford ſooner than at London, is the teſtimony of Brian Twyne [T], in

"graphicam hic aperuit, et Joannis Dedici Oxonienſis "acutiſſimi in Moralia Commentarios in lucem edidit Anno "Dom. 1518. Cantabrigienſes, citius an tam cito, hujuſ-"modi imprimendi privilegium adepti ſint, haud ſcio: "etenim ſi adepti fuiſſent, profectò Rob. Allyngboni Oxo-"nienſis Sophiſmata et Conſequentias, non Londini apud "Winandum de Worde ut ante diximus, A. D. 1510, "ſed Cantabrigiæ ſine dubio in uſum ſuum edenda cura-"viſſent."

his

in Apolog. pro Antiq. Acad. Oxon. pag. D d d 3, b. imprimé l'an 1608, in 4°. où il dit, que *les anciens écrits* disent, que l'Art Typographique a été porté premierement à Oxford, et ensuite par Caxton à Londres; quoique ce qu'il ajoute après de Jo. Scolar, soit un argument ridicule. Or Twynus a écrit 56 ans avant Atkyns. Je crois aussi d'etre en état de sauver les objections faites par Monsieur Middleton contre la date du fameux Livre imprimé à Oxford en 1468. Et ce sçavant se trompe surement touchant le premier usage des signatures en 1473. Mais comment, me direz-vous, se peut-il que Corsellis a été imprimeur en Angleterre avant Caxton, puisque celui-ci passe pour le premier typographe du royaume? Je vous ferai la même question chez nous. Comment se peut-il, que Theodoric Mertens est appellé le premier imprimeur aux Païs bas, puisque Laurent Coster a imprimé 40 ans avant lui à Harlem? Voici comment, Corsellis a été du même genre d'imprimeurs, qui se sont servi de la premiere façon d'imprimer en types de bois sculptés, puisqu'il n'a pas appris autre chose dans la boutique des heritiers de Coster. Cette espece d'imprimerie n'est jamais entrée en ligne de compte. Voila pourquoi le Chroniqueur de Cologne dit, que l'Imprimerie a été *inventée à Mayence* par Guttenberg vers l'an 1440; et après il ajoute cependant, que le Donatus a été imprimé auparavant en Hollande. Or je produirai une feuille

de

his Apolog. pro Antiq. Acad. Oxon. pag. Ddd 3, b. printed at Oxford, 1608, in 4to. where he says, the antient writings or records say, that the typographical art was first used at Oxford, and afterwards used at London by Caxton; although what he adds to it of Jo. Scolar appears to be a ridiculous argument. Now Twyne wrote fifty-six years before Atkyns. I believe I shall be also able to lay aside some of the objections made by Dr. Middleton against the date of the famous book printed at Oxford in 1468; and that learned man is certainly mistaken, touching the first use of signatures or marks in 1473; but you will say, how is it possible that Corsellis was a printer in England before Caxton, since this latter has always been held for the first printer of the kingdom? I will propose the same question to you in regard to Holland. How is it possible that Theodore Mertens can be called the first printer in the Low Countries, since Laurence Coster printed 40 years before him at Harlem? How it happens is thus. Corsellis is one of those printers who made use of the first method or way of printing; that is, by cut wooden types, since he learnt nothing else in the workshop of Coster's heirs: but this kind of printing has never entered the lists. This therefore is the reason that the Chronologist of Cologne says, that Printing was invented at Mentz by Guttenberg, about the year 1440; and yet, however, he afterwards says, that the Donatus was printed before in Holland. Now I will produce a leaf of this Donatus, which

will

de ce Donatus, qui fera voir, qu'il a été imprimé en types ſculptés de bois et mobile. Ainſi dans le ſens vulgaire Mertens eſt le premier typographe des Païs bas, Caxton de l'Angleterre; parce qu'on a prêté le nom de *imprimerie* ſeulement à l'imprimerie de metal. Mais véritablement Laurent Coſter eſt le premier des Païs bas, Corſellis de l'Angleterre. Voici un ſentiment nouveau qui vous paroîtra paradoxe. Je le prouverai clairement par raport à notre typographie Hollandoiſe. Je voudrai pouvoir le faire auſſi bien touchant l'Angleterre. J'écrirai à Monſ. Weſt, Secretaire de la Treſorerie, pour faire chercher dans les anciens Regiſtres, ſi on trouve que ces 1000 marcs, et enſuite autres 500 marcs, ont été employés pour cet effet. Car je ne veux déterrer que la pure verité de ceci. Si vous croyez qu'on peut chercher encore après quelques autres circonſtances, vous me ferez plaiſir de l'indiquer. En attendant je vous allegue mes doutes, pourquoi il ſoit impoſſible, qu' Atkyns ou quelque autre aye fabriqué toute l'Hiſtoire. Et n'auroit il pas preferé en ce cas de prêter à Caxton tout ce que vous croyez qu'il prête à Corſellis? Faire entrer au royaume un homme inconnu comme le premier imprimeur, étoit-ce le moyen de rendre ſon plan plauſible, s'il ne ſe trouvoit pas en état de vérifier ce qu'il alleguoit par la copie de ce Record? Je vous prie d'examiner tout ceci murement, et de me ſecourir là-deſſus avec vos lumieres. Car je ſuis obligé de toucher moi-même cette matiere, ſoit dans ma

Diſſertation

will prove that it was printed by cut and moveable types. Thus, in the common way of reckoning, Merten is the first printer of the Low Countries, and Caxton of England, because the name of Printing is only applied to printing by metal types; but yet, nevertheless, Laurence Coster is certainly the first of the Low Countries, and Corsellis of England. This is a new opinion, which no doubt will seem paradoxical to you. However, I will plainly prove it, that is to say in what relates to printing in Holland: I would willingly also extend it to printing in England. I will write to Mr. West, Secretary to the Treasury, to look into the antient Records of that office, to see if they can find any thing about the 1000 marks, and of the 500 marks afterwards, all employed to establish printing, for I only want to find out the truth of this. If you think that any farther circumstances can be sought out, you will do me a pleasure to notice them to me. In the mean time I alledge to you my doubts, why it is impossible that Atkins, or any one, could forge such a History. Would he not rather in such a case have preferred giving to Caxton what you think he gives to Corsellis? To make an unknown man come into the kingdom as first Printer, would that have been the means to render his plan more plausible, if he had not proofs sufficient to verify it, which he did by the copy of the Record? Let me desire you to examine this with attention, and aid me with your opinion: For I am obliged to touch upon this subject either

Dissertation même, soit dans quelque Additamentum. Et le public nous saura bon grè, que nous disons chacun notre sentiment, et en pourra juger par la avec plus de fondement.

Je vous prie d'assurer Monseigneur l'Archeveque de mes très humbles respects; me nommant avec un parfait estime,

MONSIEUR,

Votre très humble

et obéissant serviteur,

A Rotterdam,
ce 27 Dec. 1760.

G. MEERMAN.

Vito

in a Dissertation, or in some Additamentum. The public will be obliged to us if we lay before them our sentiments, and will thereby be better enabled to judge or determine with greater foundation.

Pray assure my Lord the Archbishop of my humble respects. I am, with great esteem,

SIR,

Your very humble

and obedient servant,

Rotterdam,
Dec. 27, 1760.

G. MEERMAN.

Viro consultissimo ANDREÆ COLTÉE DUCAREL I'c'to, regiæ et exemptæ Jurisdictionis S. Catharinæ juxta Turrim Londinensem Officiali principali, Civitatis et Diœcesis Cantuariensis Commissario Generali, Bibliothecæ Lambethanæ custodi, itemque almæ curiæ Cantuariensis de Arcubus London Advocato, Soc. Reg. Lond. et Antiquariorum Socio, S. P. D. GERARDUS MEERMAN.

MULTUM profecto amicitiæ, multum humanitati tuæ debeo. Quum etenim biennio abhinc apud Britannos reipublicæ causa degerem, nec tamen omnino negligerem literariam; persæpe auxilio mihi et adjumento fuisti in quæstionibus, circa quas aqua hærebat mihi. De auctoritate celebris illius excerpti e Ms. Lambethano cumprimis sollicitus eram, quod in eo typographiæ Anglicanæ primordia ab Harlemensibus, tanquam artis inventoribus, repeterentur, horum vero causa non parum mihi tunc temporis videretur dubia. Quum igitur post doctissimum Middletonum non deesse tibi nova etiam argumenta affirmares, queis excerpti illius fides labefactari ulterius posset, vehementer expetii, ut ea literis comprehensa mihi, in patriam mox reversuro, impertire aliquando velles. Id autem, licet occupatissimus, præstiturum te spopondisti, quamprimum per laborioſi

To his esteemed Friend ANDREW COLTÉE DUCAREL, LL. D. Principal Official of the Royal and Peculiar Jurisdictions of St. Catharine's near the Tower of London, Commissary General of the City and Diocese of Canterbury, Keeper of the Lambeth Library, Advocate in the High Court of Arches of the Province of Canterbury, and Fellow of the Royal and Antiquarian Societies of London, GERARD MEERMAN S. P. D.

I AM much indebted, Sir, to your friendship and politeness. Whilst resident in England about two years ago on business of the state, and not wholly unattentive to literature; I frequently experienced your ready assistance in various particulars in which I wished for information. I was in an especial manner desirous of ascertaining the authority of that extract from the Lambeth manuscript, which, by deriving the first rudiments of English Printing from Harleim, ascribed the invention to that city; a point which I then looked upon as extremely problematical. When, therefore, you assured me, that, besides what the learned Middleton had advanced, you had it in your power, by new arguments, to elucidate this extract, I earnestly entreated you to favour me with your sentiments in writing, as I was then returning to Rotterdam. And this, notwithstanding your many avocations, you promised to perform as speedily

rioſi muneris tui rationes liceret; nec fefelliſti profecto fidem. Delata enim eſt tandem ad me elegans tua et erudita hac de re epiſtola, ſed delata eo demum tempore, quo perſuaſus eram, Harlemenſium cauſam optimam alia, quam hucuſque prodierat, defenſione indigere, imo nonnulla hac de re chartis mandare cœperam. Factum hinc, cultiſſime Ducarelle (cur enim diſſimulem?), ut acquieſcere vix potuerim in rationibus ab utroque, et Middletono et te ipſo, adverſus excerpti illius fidem allatis, verum ut de integro, quanta potui cum cura, et ſepoſito tamem omni partium ſtudio, perpendenda ſuſceperim totius rei momenta. Factum hinc, ut plurima tandem argumenta in aliam me rapuerint ſententiam, imo omnes etiam nubeculæ diſparuerint. Hujus itaque rei viciſſim mei duxi eſſe officii te reddere participem, dum veniam in amica hac lite ab humanitate tua ultro mihi polliceor.

Ante omnia igitur parum veroſimile arbitror, Rich. Atkinſium, virum honeſto loco natum, quem extrema quidem ætate pauperem, nunquam vero malæ fidei fuiſſe liquet, verecundiæ fines egredi eo uſque potuiſſe, ut totam hanc hiſtoriam de tranſlata Harlemo ad Oxonienſes arte comminiſci, publicique porro juris facere auſus fuerit, adjectis perſonarum nominibus, imo minutiſſimis quoque circumſtantiis. Id vero ne abſque ullo fundamento ſtatuere videar, accipe, vir cl. omnes diſſ nſus mei a te rationes.

I. Atkinſius

as your much more material employments would permit; and you have punctually performed your engagement. I have received your elegant and learned letter on this subject; but received it at a time when I was become persuaded that the pretensions of Harleim deserved a closer investigation than they had hitherto met with; and I had actually begun to commit some particulars on that subject to writing. Hence, respectable Ducarel (for why should I dissemble?) I could not easily acquiesce in the reasons alledged by yourself and Middleton, against the authenticity of the extract: but applied myself with the utmost industry and impartiality to a serious consideration of the whole matter: and hence, as new arguments arose which confirmed the change in my sentiments, the difficulties which had embarrassed me disappeared. It is but an acknowment due to your civility, that I should in my turn communicate to you my researches; in full confidence that, in the course of this amicable dispute, I shall experience your wonted liberality.

In the first place I think it highly improbable, that Atkins (a man not meanly born, and who, though he lived to be poor in his old age, never bore a bad character) should so far transgress the bounds of decency, as to invent the whole story of translating the art from Harleim to Oxford, and should venture to publish it so circumstantially, and with names? That I may not, however, appear to speak without due foundation, I will lay before you my reasons for differing from your sentiments.

I. Atkins

I. Atkinſius non clanculum hanc diatriben edidit; at in ipſo titulo [A] nomen tum ſuum tum typographi expreſſit; indicans etiam, quos adiiſſet, fontes, hiſtorias nempe et archiva regni. Sed, quod magis ad rem facit, inſcriptioni operis ſubjecit approbationem, vel potius mandatum de edendo, ill. Moricii, regii adminiſtri. Ita vero inſtrumenti hujus Lambethani adminiculo ad populum provocare auſus eſt, ſuamque diſſertationem auctoritate publica muniri voluit Atkinſius, quam impoſtor, ſi rogare haud erubuiſſet, obtinuiſſet profecto nunquam.

II. Certum eſt, cum ex hoc Mſ. [B], quod juſſu ſumptibuſque regiis prelum in Angliam fuiſſe olim invectum docebat inferre, regique Carolo II. ac proceribus perſuadere voluiſſe, typographiam jus eſſe regale. Quo vero propriorem ad eos aditum ſibi ſterneret, diſſertationi binas dedicationes præmiſit, alteram ipſi regi, alteram utriuſque parliamenti membris inſcriptam. Demus jam verum eſſe, quod cl. Middletonus ſuſpicatus eſt, peculiarem ipſi fuiſſe ſcopum, beneficium impreſſoris regii hoc ſcripto impetrandi, tantum abeſt, ut elici inde poſſit, Atkinſium hunc in finem tale inſtrumentum confinxiſſe, ut potius illud bonam ipſius fidem probet quam maxime,

[A] See the note in p. 181.

[B] Atkins calls it *Record* AND *MS.*; which I do not deny to have been more properly expreſſed by *Record* OR *MS.* But

I. Atkins did not publiſh this diſcourſe in a private manner, but expreſſed in the title [A] of it both his own name and that of the printer: ſignifying alſo the ſources he derived it from; viz. the hiſtories and archives of the kingdom. And, what is of ſtill greater conſequence, he added to the title of the work, the approbation of a royal officer, the illuſtrious Morice, or rather his injunction for publiſhing it. So that Atkins was ſufficiently authorized to appeal to the world with reſpect to the ſupport he had from this inſtrument from Lambeth, and was willing to defend his diſcourſe by public authority, which an impoſtor, if he were not aſhamed to ſolicit it, would ſurely never have obtained.

II. Certain it is, he would infer from this manuſcript [B], that it ſhews, that the preſs was formerly brought into England at the expence of the crown; and endeavoured to perſuade king Charles II. and the nobles, that printing was a royal right. And that he might the better pave the way to this, he prefixed two dedications to the work, one addreſſed to the king, and the other to the members of both houſes of parliament. Should we now admit it to be true, what Dr. Middleton ſuſpects, that his chief end by this writing was to obtain the benefit of being king's printer; this is ſo far from proving that Atkins forged the inſtrument with ſuch deſign, that it is rather the fulleſt proof

But theſe trifles appear little to affect the chief matter in diſpute.

maxime. An etenim ſuppoſitio ad ipſum monarcham, procereſque regni accedere auſus fuiſſet, in periculum incurrens, ut muneris loco juſtas ſceleris ſui pœnas lueret? Aut ſi eos acquieſcere hac in re potuiſſe perperam ſtatuas, an credibile eſt, typographos Anglos, quorum nullo modo intererat, impreſſoriam artem ut regale conſiderari, imponi ſibi paſſuros fuiſſe inſtrumento ſubleſtæ fidei, neque quenquam repertum, qui hominis nequitiam ſcripto aliquo debito perſtringeret?

III. Candorem porro Atkinſii confirmat ipſius expoſitio, cui hoc Mſ. deberet. Recepiſſe enim illud ſe teſtatur a viro digniſſimo, ac bibliothecæ Lambethanæ, e cujus authentico deſcriptum id fuerit, quondam cuſtode. Ea vero perſona ſatis hoc pacto deſignata latere neminem hunc temporis poterat, ejuſque opera detegere idcirco in proclivi erat, quid de rei foret veritate.

Sed audio jam Middletoni manes, audio te ipſum, v. cl., regerentes mihi, rem minime confectam, etſi de bona Atkinſii fide conſtet: fieri etenim poſſe, ut inſtrumentum ab alio confictum, et tamen ille nihil fraudis ſubodoratus fuerit. Hæc itaque ut removeatur ſuſpicio neceſſe eſt, ut ipſius excerpti integritatem ulterius vindicemus.

IV. Quo

of his integrity. For can any one suppose, that, by being hardy enough to address the monarch and the nobility, he would run the risque, instead of getting a reward, of being justly punished for his villainy? Or, if you conclude that they would inconsiderately acquiesce in this, is it credible that the English printers, none of whom considered printing as the property of the crown, would suffer themselves to be imposed on by a record of doubtful credit; and that not a single person, by any writing, should take the least notice of the man's fraud? see p. 298.

III. Moreover, Atkins's own declaring to whom he was indebted for this manuscript, evidences his candour. For he asserts, that he received it from a very worthy man, formerly keeper of the Lambeth library, and that it was transcribed from the original. A person in such an office could not at that time be concealed from any one, and therefore it was an easy matter to discover what truth there was in his narrative.

But methinks I hear Middleton's manes, and you, illustrious Sir, retorting, that the matter is far from being cleared up, though Atkins's fidelity be proved; as it might possibly happen that the deed might be framed by another, and he, nevertheless, acquitted of the least tincture of fraud. In order to remove this suspicion, it will be necessary farther to prove the genuineness of his extract.

IV. Quo tempore ergo auctor suam dissertationem emisit, nemo de veritate ejus historiæ vel tantillum dubitavit, quemadmodum et Ant. Woodi verba *in Historia et Antiquitatibus Universitatis Oxoniensis* [C], et quæ inscriptioni sepulchrali Nicolai Corsellis, a. 1674, inserta sunt, probant. At nostro demum seculo ineunte, quum et Atkinsii et memorati bibliothecæ Lambethanæ custodis fama intercidisset, reperiri vero originale Ms. amplius haud posset, nonnulli hujus documenti integritatem in controversiam vocare cœperunt, obloquentibus tamen aliis [D], donec a. 1735, majora ausus vir elegantissimi ingenii Middletonus speciosis quibusdam argumentis totam hanc historiam pro commento habendam universæ prope nationi Britannicæ persuasit.

V. Jo. Bagfordus, qui natus in Angliâ est a. 1651, adeoque Atkinsium (a. 1677 demum fato functum) nosse potuit, atque ipse maximus veterum cimeliorum fuit helluo, in *Historia Typographiæ Oxoniensis*, te ipso judice, v. cl. eos reprehendit, qui de Lambethani Ms. fide dubitabant; addita ratione, quod certo ipsi constaret, copiam, quam vocant, authenticam aliquamdiu penes Jo. Birkenheadium, equitem baronettum, exstitisse, quum a. 1665, demandata ipsi a parliamento inferiore, cui intererat, provincia esset, varia

[C] Tom. i. p. 226.

[D] Thus MAITTAIRE *Annal. Typogr.* tom. i. p. 30. 1st edit.

IV. When the author, therefore, published his dissertation, no one entertained the least doubt of the truth of his story, which appears from Ant. Wood's words in his History and Antiquities of Oxford [C], and which are inserted on the tomb stone of Nic. Corsellis *, anno 1674. But at length, in the beginning of the present century, when the memory both of Atkins and of the fore-mentioned librarian of Lambeth were forgotten, and the original manuscript could not be found, some persons began to doubt of the reality of the proof, while others contradicted them [D], till in 1735, Middleton, who was bolder than the rest, and a man of extraordinary talents, made almost the whole British nation believe, by specious arguments, that this history ought to be considered as a fiction throughout.

V. Jo. Bagford, who was born in England in 1651, and therefore might be acquainted with Atkins (who died in 1677), and who was immoderately fond of antient curiosities, in his *Historia Typographiæ Oxoniensis*, as you have shewn, blamed those who had any doubts concerning the Lambeth manuscript; alledging for a reason, that the copy, which was deemed an authentic one, and had been for some time in the possession of Sir Jo. Birkenhead, Bart. was extant when in 1664 it was intrusted to him by the house of commons, at

edit. 1719. *Quæ ex Lambethano MS. descripsit (Atkinsius), de eorum veritate cur dubitemus, non video.*

* See above, p. 163.

which

hac in parte negligeret, ipsum originale instrumentum ab Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi (Gilb. Sheldon) vel bibliothecæ Lambethanæ custode requisivit (juxta facultatem delegatis parliamenti memoris concessum, chartas quascunque, etiam arcanissimas, in commissione sua usui futuras, postulandi, ut a peritis Britannis accepi) cujus deinde, ob memorabiles circumstantias circa typographiæ in Anglia incunabula, apographum legale per notarium quendam formari jussit. At mancam tamen esse, quam ex hoc monumento traxerat Atkinsius, consequentiam animadvertens Birkenheadius inutile duxit quidquam de re referre ad senatum; aut si retulisse fingamus, frustraneæ saltem graphiario visum est operæ, actis inserimentionem instrumenti, quod examinandum motu proprio susceperat Birkenheadius, neque obstare renovationi pristinæ legis voce declaraverat.

VI. Pondus insuper relationi Atkinsianæ addit excerptum ex alio libello Ms. quod Sam. Palmer in historia typographices [E], verum suo more, id est, parum bona fide, produxit, nobiscum vero ex authentico descriptum communicavit ejusdem possessor, amicusque vester, M. C. Tutet; quod hic adjicere utile erit. En ergo locum integrum.

The

and, that no particular ſhould be neglected, he demanded the original inſtrument of the Archbiſhop of Canterbury (Gilb. Sheldon), or of his librarian (agreeable to the power given to a committee of parliament, who have authority, whenever they think neceſſary, to call for even the moſt private papers, as I was told by ſome intelligent Engliſhmen), a draught of which he at length cauſed to be taken by a notary, on account of ſome remarkable circumſtances relating to the commencement of printing in England. But Birkenhead, conſidering the copy which Atkins drew from this record to be imperfect, thought it needleſs to produce any thing concerning it to the parliament; or if we ſuppoſe he did do ſo, it would have been ſuperfluous in the ſecretary to mention an inſtrument in the journals, which Birkenhead had undertaken of his own accord to examine, and which he had declared could be no hindrance to the renewal of the antient law.

VI. Furthermore, what adds ~~ſome~~ weight to Atkins's account, is an extract taken from another little manuſcript book, which Sam. Palmer, in his Hiſtory of Printing [E], after his manner indeed, that is, with little credit, has produced; and of which our friend Mr. Tutet, the owner of it, has communicated an authentic copy from the original; which it may be uſeful to add here. The following is the whole paſſage:

[E] Pag. Rr. 4.

"The Art of Printing was at firſt brought into England in the time of Henry V, at the charges of the Arch-bp. of Canterbury (Boutchier), who employed one Turner, Maſter of the Robes to the K. and one Wm Caxton, a mercer of London, but uſing the trade of a merchant, to go to Harleim, to endeavour to bring over ſome of the workmen, that had then newly practiſed that art there, who prevailed with ſome of the under-workmen to come over with them into England, and to teach others their trade. As ſoon as they were landed, they were conveyed under a guard to the Univerſity of Oxford, for fear they ſhould run back again; and there they ſet up a preſs about the year 1576, as appears by ſeveral books that were printed there about that time. The names of thoſe workmen were Wood an Almayn and Wincken de Word (N. B. hic in margine Mſ. additur: Moxon ſays, his name was Fred. Corſellis): and the charge of this journey coſt the Archbiſhop 150 marks, as appears by ſeveral papers and memorials relating to this matter, that are ſtill extant in the library at Lambeth."

q. whether not Rood see p. 298

Scriptum hoc multo videri antiquius anno 1664, quo Atkinſius diatriben ſuam emiſit, ſcribit idem Palmerius, quod diſplicet Tuteto, quum mentio hic fiat Joſephi Moxoni, ejus vero *mechanical exerciſes*, in queis nonnulla de arte impreſſoria, demum a. 1677, prodierint. Verum notula illa de Moxono, quum non

"*The Art of Printing was first brought into England* "*in the time of H. V. at the charges of the Arch-bp. of* "*Canterbury (Boutcher), who employed one Turner,* "*Master of the Robes to the K. and one Wm Caxton,* "*a mercer of London, but using the trade of a merchant,* "*to go to Harleim, to endeavour to bring over some of* "*the workmen, that had then newly practised that art* "*there, who prevailed with some of the underworkmen* "*to come over with them into England, and to teach* "*others their trade. As soon as they were landed, they* "*were conveyed under a guard to the University of Ox-* "*ford for fear they should run back again; and there* "*they set up a press about the year* 1576, *as appears* "*by several books that were printed there about that* "*time. The names of those workmen were Wood an* "*Almayn & Wincken de Word (N. B. in the margin* "*of the Ms. is added here: Moxon says, his name was* "*Fred. Corsellis): and the charge of this journey cost the* "*Arch-bp.* 150 *marks, as appears by several papers* "*and memorials relating to this matter, that are still* "*extant in the library at Lambeth.*"

The same Palmer, it is true, adds, that this transcript appeared to be much older than 1664, when Atkins published his discourse; which Mr. Tutet objects to, as it mentions Joseph Moxon's *Mechanical Exercises*, in which some things concerning printing are related so late as 1677. But that little remark about Moxon, as it is only in the margin, might have been an interpolation. However it be

non nisi in margine reperiatur, recentioris esse potest, atque ipse contextus, temporis. Imo quidquid de ætate ejus libelli Ms. est, id certum, auctorem hæc non hausisse ex impresso opere Atkinsii, a quo non uno loco variat, sed ex aliquo rescire debuisse, qui bibliothecæ Lambethanæ chartas lustraverat quidem, sed nonnullas circumstantias non bene ipsi retulerat, quum circa historiam translatæ Oxoniam artis graviter lapsus fuerit et in tempore, et in nomine operarii [F], et in impensa summa. In quatuor tamen circumstantiis convenit huic auctori cum Ms. Atkinsiano. 1. Quod Oxoniam primum adlata sit ars. 2. Quod hortante Archiep. Bourcherio, opitulantibus Turnourio et Caxtono, peractum id fuerit. 3. Quod operarius ille Harlemo arcessitus fuerit. 4. Quod Harlemi primum omnium ars fuerit exercita.

VII. Jam ante Atkinsii tempora constitit, typographiam Angliæ finibus recens appulsam, Oxoniam primum devenisse. Id certe Brianus Twynus in *Apologia pro antiquitate Academiæ Oxoniensis*, edita a. 1608, *antiqua scripta* referre ait [G]; unde verosimile

[F] Palmer, in the abovementioned book, p. 135, writes, that he has read, in the English historians, that Corsellis and Rood were brought over by Caxton. I wish he could even mention one of them. But this impostor frequently deceives his readers by his craft.

[G] See the whole place, p. F f f 3. which is falsely printed D d d 3. *Artem typographicam, Angliæ finibus recenter*

respecting the age of the manuscript, this is certain, that the author did not extract these things from Atkins's printed work, from whom it nothing varies, but must have learnt them from some person who had attentively perused the writings in the Lambeth library, and who had not properly related to him some particulars, as he has egregiously erred with respect to the Oxford history of the art's being translated, both in time, name of the workman [F], and the whole expence. Nevertheless, in four circumstances this author agrees with Atkins's manuscript. 1. That the art was first brought to Oxford. 2. That by the advice of Archbishop Bourchier, and the assistance of Turner and Caxton, it was completed. 3. That the workman was fetched from Harleim. 4. That this first of all arts was earliest practised at Harleim.

VII. Now it is evident, that before Atkins's time the Art of Printing, newly arrived in England, came first to Oxford. Brian Twyne, in his *Apologia pro Antiquitate Academiæ Oxoniensis*, published in 1608, certainly says, that it restored the *antient writings* [G]; from whence it is probable, that he might have heard

center appulsam, Oxoniam primo devenisse, unde Gulielmi Caxtoni opera Londinum quoque traductam esse, non solum antiqua scripta referunt, sed etiam illud indicat, quod Jo. Scolar primus Oxoniensis typographus officinam typographicam his aperuit, et Joannis Dedici Oxoniensis acutissimi in Moralia Commentarios in lucem edidit anno Dom. 1518.

somewhat

mile eſt, eum de hoc Mſ. Lambethano aliquid inaudiſſe (licet ſiculneum porro ſit, quod pro antiquitate preli Oxonienſis petit, argumentum ex officina Jo. Scolar, poſt Caxtonianam annis fere 44. erecta). Quo ſenſu etiam Carolus I. rex, in literis patentibus ad Academiam Oxonienſem datis 5 non. Martias, anno regni undecimo, id eſt, a. 1635, ſcripſit, a tranſlatione artis typographicæ in Angliam librorum impreſſores in Univerſitate Oxonienſi exſtitiſſe [H].

VIII. Vetuſtatem porro Oxonienſis preli præ reliquis Anglicanis, certe Weſtmonaſterienſi, quæ a. 1474. cœpit, vulgoque princeps habetur, manifeſte probat *Expoſitio Hieronymi in Symbolum Apoſtolorum*, cui addita ſubſcriptio: *Oxoniæ impreſſa et finita anno Domini* M.CCCC.LXVIII. XVII *die Decembris*. Hanc vero epigraphen fingere haud licet a falſario manu fuiſſe additam (ut circa Plinii *epiſtolarum librum primum* aliquot abhinc annis factum bene obſervaſti, v. cl.), quum in omnibus exemplaribus diſtincte impreſſa

[H] The learned Dr. W. Blackstone, Profeſſor of Law at Oxford, moſt obligingly tranſmitted me the following extract from the archives of that Univerſity; *Et cum pene, a tempore quo primum ars typographica in hoc regnum noſtrum Angliæ applicuit, typographi, ſive librorum impreſſores, tam de alienigenis, quam de indigenis, in univerſitate Oxon. extiterint, qui cujuſcunque generis libros, authoritate privilegiorum ejuſdem univerſitatis, per progenitores noſtros conceſſorum, ante quamcunque chartam, inhibitionem, reſtrictionem, aut limitationem*

ſomewhat of this Lambeth manuſcript (though it is but a ſorry argument to prove the antiquity of the Oxford preſs, that it came from Jo. Scolar's workſhop, which was built near 44 years after Caxton's). In which ſenſe, K. Charles I, in his letters patent to the Univerſity of Oxford, dated March 5, in the 11th year of his reign, i. e. 1635, wrote, that from the introduction of the art there were printers of books in the Univerſity of Oxford [H].

VIII. Moreover, the antiquity of the Oxford preſs above all others in England is without doubt evidently proved by the *Expoſitio* HIERONYMI *in Symbolum Apoſtolorum*, which he began at Weſtminſter in 1474, and is eſteemed the earlieſt, with this ſubſcription: *Oxoniæ impreſſa et finita anno Domini* M.CCCC.LXVIII. xvii *die Decembris.* And we cannot ſuppoſe this colophon to have been forged and added by a falſe hand (as you well know to have been the caſe re- obscure?
ſpecting PLINII *Epiſtolarum librum primum*, ſome years

limitationem ſuper libris imprimendis inde in contrariam factas, liberam imprimendi, ac impreſſos libros diſtrahendi, ac publice per totum regnum noſtrum venditioni exponendi, poteſtatem habuerunt, ipſo Cancellario, ſive ejus Commiſſario licentias et privilegia ad hujuſmodi libros conferente, varioſque inde libros, opuſcula, et tractatus ibidem ſub prelo typographico in lucem emiſerunt: ſicut ex ipſis impreſſis monumentis, quæ etiamnum hodie extant, manifeſte conſtat. Therefore our Lord the king confirms and enlarges ſuch privileges and rights of the univerſity, as appertain to printing.

ago),

preſſa occurrat, qualia ipſe vidi tria, unum in bibliotheca Bodleiana Oxoniæ, alterum in publica Cantabrigienſi, tertiumque in amici mei Jac. Weſtii Muſeo Londini. Novi quidem, cl. Middletonum [I] hanc ſubſcriptionem mendoſam ſtatuiſſe, et pro 1468, legi voluiſſe 1478, ſed argumenta ejus multum abeſt, ut perſuadendi vim apud me inveniant. Character ſane hujus opuſculi ipſiſſimus cum Ariſtotelis Ethica, interprete Leon. Aretino, et Ægid. de Roma lib. de peccato originali, Oxoniæ a. 1479, editis, tres hoſce libellos eidem fere tempori tribuendos nullo modo probat [K], quum unus ſæpe impreſſor per plures annos iiſdem typis uſus fuerit, prout Fauſti, Schoefferique, et aliorum exempla bene multa evincunt [L]. Imo quum proximi libri Oxonienſes a. 1480, et ſeq. alio plane charactere, et per Theodoricum Rood, Colonienſem, excuſi fuerint (M), colligere eſt, huic alium jam præiviſſe impreſſorem, quem Frid. de Corſellis tamdiu ſtatuam, donec quis mihi probaverit contra-

[I] After his example, it is ſo adjudged by Lewis in the Life of Caxton, p. 22. ſeq. Ames, Typographical Antiquities, p. 438. Marchand, Hiſt. de l'Imprim. p. 56.

[K] In theſe three little books of Ant. Wood there appear to be fairer and clearer types than in the more recent impreſſions. And certainly, as Schöepflin, Vindic. cap. I. § 9. obſerves, many books occur in *cut* types, which ſurpaſs in beauty thoſe that are *caſt*. It is not to be wondered at,

ago), since it occurs, distinctly printed, in all the copies, three of which I have seen, one in the Bodleian library at Oxford, another in the Cambridge library, and a third in my friend Mr. James West's Museum at London. I know, indeed, that Middleton [I] concluded this colophon to be a false one, and was inclined to read 1478 for 1468; but his arguments are far from convincing me. Surely the character used in this work being the very same with *Aristotelis ethica, interprete Leon. Aretino*, and *Ægid. de Roma lib. de peccato originali*, published at Oxford in 1479, by no means proves that these three little books are to be ascribed nearly to the same time [K], as a printer often uses the same types for a number of years, which plainly appears by Faustus, Schoeffer, and many other examples [L]. Nay, as the next Oxford book, in 1480 and the following year, were plainly in another character, and printed by Theodoric Rood of Cologne [M], we may infer that another printer preceded him, whom I shall maintain to be Frederick Corsellis, till any one shall convince me of the con-

at, if Corsellis, who applied himself from 1458 to nearly 1468 in preparing and improving the printing types, should at length equal engraving in elegance.

[L] That no one may infer that this is the case with *cast* types only, I will refer to the Psalter in 1457. 1459. and 1490. published at Mentz all in the same *cut* character. See MEERMAN's *Orig. Typogr.* cap. I. § ult.

[M] See Wood, vol. I. p. 227. Ames, p. 438.

contrarium [M*]. Nec eſt, quod intra annos 1468 et 1479, otioſum propterea fuiſſe Corſellium fingamus, qui varia interim opuſcula abſque anni, loci, et nominis ſui indiciis emittere potuit [N], ut fecit Ulr. Zellius Coloniae, cujus ab a. 1467 ad 1473, et ab hoc tempore ad 1494, liber cum ejuſmodi criteriis innotuit hucuſque nullus [N*]. Quod denique attinet ad ſignaturas in Hieronymiana hac editione reperiundas, ſuſpectam illae neutiquam reddere poſſunt anni impreſſionis notam; quum in codicibus Mſſ. vetuſtioribus jam interdum compareant [O], hoſque olim imitari ſtuduerint typographi [P]; quum porro iiſdem ad opera xylographica uſa jam fuerit Laurentiana [Q], e qua Corſellius prodierat, officina, et hujus deinceps exemplo uſi ſint principes alibi locorum impreſſores, certe Lutetiæ [R], ac in villa Beronenſi apud Helvetos a. 1470 [S], itemque Ant-

[M*] It is not at all ſurprizing, that Corſellis ſhould not ſubjoin his name to any of his books; he was not ſingular in this, as I have ſhewn concerning J. Peterſham, Orig. Cap. I. § ult. not. *df*.

[N] Thomas Hearne ſeems to have diſcovered two books of this kind, to wit, ACTUS *Alexandri Magni*, and GUIDONIS DE COLUMPNA *Hiſtoriam deſtructionis Troiae*. See his Note on THOM. CAII *Vindic. Antiquit. Acad. Oxon.* p. 801. ſeq. when it is probable, that this very learned antiquary, from the ſimilitude of the type to that in Jerom, knew it to be Corſellis's preſs.

[N*] See *Orig. Typogr.* cap. III. not. *i*. and Remarks on *Append. docum.* N. 5.

trary [M*]. Nor is there any reason to imagine Corsellis was idle from 1468 to 1479, as he might publish many smaller works in that time without affixing to them the distinctions of year, place, and name [N], as Ulric Zellius of Cologne did, none of whose books, from 1467 to 1473, and from that time to 1494, have been hitherto distinguished by any peculiar marks [N*]. With regard to the signatures to be met with in this edition of Jerom, they cannot in the least render the date of the year suspected; as they sometimes appear in the more ancient manuscript books [O], and the printers formerly endeavoured to copy after them [P]; and were used in the works with wooden types from Laurence's workshop [Q], where Corsellis was employed; and the principal printers in other places afterwards followed his example, viz. in Paris [R], in Bern in Switzerland, an. 1470 [S], also at Antwerp in

[O] See Anonym. in Transact. Philos. 1703 N. 208. tom. II. Monum. Typogr. WOLFII, p. 983.

[P] See *Orig. Typ.* cap. I. § 3. not. *r*.

[Q] See *Orig. Typ.* cap. ult. § 4. seq.

[R] In GASP. PERGAMENSIS *Epistolæ*, published at Paris, without the date, we find signatures. See MAITTAIRE, tom. I. *Annal. Typogr.* p. 293. edit. 2. The same writer affirms them to have appeared ever since 1470, p. 25. seq.

[S] Mammotrectus attests this, and its being printed with Elias de Llouffen's types in that year. Palmer, also, p. 54. alludes to a TERENCE, printed at Milan in 1470, with signatures, by Ant. Zarotus: whether this be true or not, let those examine who have a number of books of that sort.

verpiæ a. 1472 [T], ut adeo tota via erraverit Middletonus, dum Venetiis a. 1474, illas a Jo. de Colonia et Jo. Manthen de Gherretzem [U] primum introductas conjecit [X].

IX. In ipsa tandem hac relatione plura occurrunt, quæ cum aliis testimoniis non modo haud pugnant, sed mirifice etiam consentiunt. Mitto, quod ibi tradatur, Thomam Bourcherium Cancellarium Universitatis Oxoniensis, atque inde Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem fuisse sub Henrico VI. rege; mitto, Caxtonum cum Belgis commercium instituisse, cujus utriusque circumstantiæ veritas aliunde comperta est [Y]. Propius nos respiciunt, quæ de inventione typographiæ

[T] This is proved by a Dutch treatise, *De Tondali visione*, which I have taken notice of, at the close of note *e* in *Orig. Typ.* cap. V.

[U] Middleton deduces his argument from *Lectura* BALDI *super Codicem*, printed in 1474 by these printers, where they begin to use signatures in the middle of the book. But that proves only that signature letters became at length known amongst them, or were thought of by them: but not in the least that they were the inventors. I nevertheless readily agree with this celebrated person, that before this time signatures were very seldom used, and not universally adopted till long after. I have indeed in my possession a Roman edition of SEXT. POMP. FESTUS, 1475, by John Reynhard de Enyngen, printed without those signatures; neither did Caxton begin to use

1472 [T]; so that Middleton has erred throughout, in conjecturing that the Venetians, in 1474, from John of Cologne and Jo. Manthen de Gherretzem [U], were the first who introduced them [X].

IX. After all, many things occur in this relation, which are not only far from clashing with other testimonies, but rather coincide with them surprizingly; not to mention its being there said, that Thomas Bourcher was Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury under Henry VI; nor that Caxton carried-on a trade with the Dutch; the truth of both which circumstances is confirmed elsewhere [Y]. What is there re-

use them before 1481. See Middleton's *Diss.* p. 9. Ames, p. 26.

[X] Besides these arguments, Marchant seeks another from the form of *Expositio Sancti Hieronymi*, which, being in 8vo *. he could hardly believe was so antient as the year 1468: but without reason, as in a similar case, as αὐτόπτης [an eye-witness] I can pronounce, that, in 1467, Ulric Zell of Cologne used them for AUGUSTINUS *de singularitate clericorum*; nay, Laurence of Harleim used even a less form for his *Horarium*. But I can scarcely understand the argument which Marchant draws from the character of a little Gothic book, as it was both used by the worthy inventor, and always received in Corsellis's time, and first introduced into Rome by the Italian printers.

[Y] Concerning Bourcher, consult Wood. tom. II. p. 405, seq. Of Caxton, see Lewis, p. 2.

* Marchant reasons here from erroneous premisses; the book in question is a small 4to. See p. 182. J. N.

lated

typographiæ apud Harlemenſes illic narrantur, et a nobis ex profeſſo adſtructa ſunt [Z]. Ea certe vix eſt, ut vel ab Atkinſio, vel quovis alio recentiori ſcriptore Anglo, proficiſci potuerint, qui hiſtoriam tranſlati ad Britannos preli e cerebro ſuo fabricaturus, utique conſtantem, et ab omnibus antea hujus regni hiſtoriographis paſſim traditam opinionem [AA] de reperta Moguntiæ arte amplexus fuiſſet (diſtinctio enim inter ligneos typos et metallicos parum ſeculo ſuperiore cognita erat), ſuumque proinde operarium inde, non Harlemo, repetiiſſet, ut commenta ſua quadam veri ſpecie coloraret. Aſt rem conficit inſerta huic hiſtoriæ memorabilis illa circumſtantia, Moguntiam artem primum recepiſſe per fratrem operarii alicujus Harlemi, poſtquam per hunc artis principiis imbutus eſſet. Ea vero narratio, neque Maittairio neque ulli mortalium hactenus perſpecta, quum utrique conveniat Joanni Gensfleiſchio typographo, ſeniori, juniorique, atque hæc circumſtantia, ſuperiore ſeculo incognita, a me demum ex collatione veterum chartarum et teſtimoniorum, noſtra ætate productorum, detecta ſit, fieri haud poteſt, ut vel Atkinſio vel alii cuivis apud Britannos [BB], niſi oraculi cujuſdam

[Z] The author is miſtaken in the name of the Harleim inventor, whom he ſuppoſed to be Gutenberg, confounding the attempts of the Dutch and Germans.

[AA] Thus CAXTON, the Author of the *Chronicle* of *St. Alban's*, FABIAN, HOLLINSHED, BAKER, STOW, whom I have conſulted; and perhaps ſome others that I have not ſeen.

[BB] I allow, that Bohuſl. Balbin, ſec. xvii. was not ignorant

lated of the invention of the art at Harleim is much more to the purpoſe of what we profeſſedly have adduced on that head [Z]. It is ſurely hardly poſſible, that either Atkins, or any later Engliſh writer, ſhould ſet about fabricating a groundleſs tradition that a preſs was brought over to England, or ſhould embrace as his ſtedfaſt opinion, what was handed down by all the hiſtorians of this kingdom [AA], that the art was found out at Mentz (for the diſtinction between wooden and metal types was but little known in the preceding century), and ſhould therefore fetch his workmen from thence, rather than Harleim, in order to give ſome colour of truth to his fiction. But a remarkable circumſtance inſerted in this hiſtory determines the matter, that the art was firſt of all received at Mentz by the brother of a workman at Harleim, who was by him afterwards inſtructed in the principles of it. And this ſtory, which has never before been noticed either by Maittaire or any other writer, as it agrees both with John Geinsfleiſch the elder and younger (a circumſtance unknown in the laſt century) being at length diſcovered by my compariſon of the antient writings and teſtimonies produced in our time, it is hardly poſſible that it ſhould enter into Atkins's thoughts, or thoſe of any other Engliſhman [BB],

ignorant that two brothers were the firſt printers in Germany, as mentioned *Orig. Typ.* cap. xvii. ſec. 9; but he was a German, and had in his hands many documents never publiſhed, which were known to Atkins; and it is not probable that this circumſtance was diſcovered.

unleſs

jusdam monitu instructo, in mentem illa venire potuerit; sed proficisci ea necessario debuit a scriptore non adeo multum a tempore inventionis remoto, cui saltem hæc hiostria ex optimis monumentis probe erat perspecta.

Ita vero auctoritate hujus excerpti, nisi me omnia fallant, vindicata, æquum est, ut ea solvam dubia, quæ contra illius fidem hactenus allata sunt, partim a Middletono, partim a te ipso, v. cl. [CC].

Primarium quidem argumentum inde petitur, quod quum Atkinsius originale Ms. in bibliotheca Lambethana suo tempore exstare tradiderit, id tamen neque inter libros neque archiva illic reperiri potuerit; etiamsi sæpius, in gratiam tum ill. Thomæ Herbert, Pembrokiæ comitis, tum aliorum, diligens ad hoc novata fuerit opera; imo quamvis omnia illic cimelia sedulo a te examinata, indiceque, quem tuo beneficio ipse inspexi, accuratissimo comprehensa fuerint. Et sane hæc ratio persuadet mihi, illud neque

[CC] Before Middleton, S. Palmer first opposed the authority of this manuscript, and afterwards endeavoured to defend it. But all his arguments are so absurd, that it would be only losing time to dwell upon them. And what Fournier has lately advanced on this head falls to the ground of itself from his own preceding argument. It may be observed however, that he is wrong in supposing that 1500 marks were requisite for erecting a printing-house in England, because for this purpose the making of a press, the types, and a few other materials, would be sufficient; so much money

unleſs revealed by an oracle; but muſt neceſſarily have proceeded from ſome writer near the time of its invention, by whom this hiſtory, which was framed from authentic materials, was thoroughly underſtood.

But the authority of this extract being, I flatter myſelf, thus vindicated, it will be neceſſary that I ſhould remove the doubts which have hitherto been ſtarted againſt the credibility of it, partly by Middleton, and partly by yourſelf [CC].

The principal argument is, that whereas Atkins reported that the original manuſcript was in the Lambeth library in his time, it can nevertheleſs neither be found amongſt the books or archives there (although frequently, at the inſtance of the illuſtrious Thomas Herbert Earl of Pembroke and others, diligent ſearch hath been made for it); nor can any trace of it be diſcovered by your diligent reſearches among the MSS. or in the accurate index of them which through your kindneſs I myſelf inſpected. I am convinced, therefore, that it nei-

money not being wanted at that time. He might havec conſidered, that an apparatus of that kind could not be collected in England without a previous knowledge of the art, which was to be ſought for elſewhere; and it was much more difficult to obtain privily all thoſe materials from the workſhop at Harleim (the uſe of which alſo, without the direction of a ſkilful workman, would greatly perplex the Engliſh) than to ſeduce away a workman: and how can Fournier prove that one could have been had at a cheaper rate?

neque ſupereſſe ibi, neque a pluribus retro luſtris ſuperfuiſſe amplius; minime autem probat, non exſtitiſſe a. 1664, quo ſcribebat Atkinſius. Copia enim, de qua locuti ſumus, authentica, quæque hoc ipſo anno penes Birkenheadium erat, pro originali inſtrumento teſtis eſt omni exceptione major. Archetypum ergo ſi revera exſtitit, quidni latuiſſet tum temporis in Lambethanis ædibus, quum Atkinſius diſtincte tradiderit, id inveniri non in Archiep. Cantuarienſis, verum ipſius ſedis biliotheca; illius autem, ut hac in parte veritati parceret, nullo modo intereſſet? Ita vero locum haud occupavit in *libro memoriali* Archiep. Bourcherii, cui illa potiſſimum inſerta ſunt, quæ jura Archiepiſcopatus ſpectant, ſed veroſimiliter inter plures chartas et rationes ad Bourcherium pertinentes, quales magna copia illic aſſervari nuper mihi ſignificaſti [DD]. Neque obſtat, quod illic haud ſuperſit amplius. Quot enim quantaque dantur exempla, ut veteres libri chartæve e bibliothecis, quarum partem olim conſtituerunt, tandem exulaverint; nec furto tantum, ſed etiam caſu fortuito, cuſtodumve incuria, dum hujuſmodi reliquias aliorum uſui impertientes repetere in tempore neglexerunt? Simile fatum huic Mſ. ut ſuſpicor, peperit exitium. Birkenheadius enim, ut vidimus, originale

[DD] Dr. Ducarel, many years after he ſent me the longer epiſtle which ~~have~~ I publiſhed, wrote me word, that in Lambeth palace were found ſeven ſacks full of various writings on parchment, executed in the time of Henry

ther remains there now, nor hath been there for many years; yet this by no means proves that it was not there in 1664, when Atkins wrote: for the authentic copy in queſtion, which was that year in the poſſeſſion of Birkenhead, is a voucher for the original inſtrument, ſuperior to all objection. But, if the original was then extant, why might it not be concealed in Lambeth-palace; as Atkins clearly declares, that it was not found in the Archbiſhop's private library, but in that belonging to the ſee; and it could have been no advantage to him to have concealed the truth in this inſtance. It could hardly indeed have a place in the *memorial-book* of Archbiſhop Bourcher, of which the principal contents relate to the archbiſhoprick; but was likely to be among the papers and accounts belonging to Bourcher, of which you lately told me a great number was preſerved there [DD]. Nor does it affect the argument, though it ſhould be no longer exiſting: for how many ſtriking examples have there been of antient books and papers having been detached from libraries of which they were formerly a part, not merely by theft, but alſo by accident, or by careleſſneſs in the keeper, in neglecting to recall ſuch as were lent out! I ſuſpect that this manuſcript has undergone ſome ſuch fate. For Birken-

Henry VI. from 1422 to 1460; and alſo ſome accounts of the expences and income of Archbiſhop Bourcher, which are intituled, *Computus Generales Baillivorum et miniſtrorum Dom. Archiepiſcopi.*

originale inſtrumentum a. 1664 expetens *, et per ſcribam publicum tranſcribi jubens, finito negotio a Parliamenti interiore ſibi demandato, id forte cuſtodi bibliothecæ Lambethanæ reſtituere ſtatim prætermiſit; forte etiam ſuperioris parliamenti deputatis, aut ſi malis, regi, hujuſve miniſtris, curioſis agitatam quæſtionem circa jus typographiæ regale denuo examinandi, tradere juſſus eſt. Atque ita, dum per aliquod tempus extra legitimam ſedem vagaretur id Mſ. periiſſe hoc tandem arbitror atroci illo incendio Londinenſi, d. 3. Septemb. 1666, quod pluſquam tredecim mille ædes, et monumenta literaria innumera conſumſit. Iſthæc quibus diſplicet conjectura, illi operam velim navent, ut (quod vehementer opto) exhibitione originalis inſtrumenti convincere me erroris aliquando poſſint.

Alterum argumentum elicitur e circumſtantiis temporis, quibus parum convenire hanc hiſtoriam putat Middletonus, quod Rex Henricus VI. bello civili tum involutus eſſet †. At nollem hoc argumentum tanto viro excidiſſet. Quid ſi enim ipſi opponam exempla bene multa ex hiſtoria, tum vetere, tum recenti, ubi media inter bella inteſtina artes ſcientiæque fuere promotæ? Sed non opus erit, ut iis congerendis bonas horas perdam. Animadvertiſſe ſuffecerit, Archiepiſcopum Cantuarienſem bene perſpexiſſe

* See Origin of Printing, p. 17. N.

† Ibid. p. 8. N.

head, as we have ſeen, borrowing the original inſtrument in 1664, and ordering it to be tranſcribed by a common clerk, after having completed the buſineſs aſſigned him by the Houſe of Commons, might perhaps neglect to return it immediately to the Lambeth library; or he might poſſibly be commanded to deliver it to ſome officer of the Houſe of Lords, or, if you will, to the King, or his Miniſters, who might be curious to examine the queſtion in diſpute, relating to the crown's prerogative in the printing art. Hence the manuſcript might be ſhifted about from its proper place, and I ſuppoſe might at length have been deſtroyed in the dreadful fire of London, Sept. 3, 1666, when upwards of 13,000 houſes, and an infinite number of learned productions, were conſumed. If any one diſlike this conjecture, I ſhall be happy if he would endeavour (which I ardently wiſh) to convince me of my error, by ſhewing me the original inſtrument.

Another argument is drawn from the circumſtances of the times, with which Middleton thinks this hiſtory can but ill agree, becauſe Henry VI. was then involved in a civil war. But I am ſorry ſuch an argument ſhould be urged by ſuch a writer. What if, in oppoſition to him, I ſhould produce many examples, both antient and modern, of various arts and ſciences flouriſhing during civil wars? But there is no need to waſte time in collecting them. Suffice it to obſerve, that the Archbiſhop of Canterbury well knew the benefit that would accrue to his fellow-

ſubjects

ſpexiſſe utilitatem, e typographiæ exercitio ad populares ſuos redundaturam, eamque ob oculos poſuiſſe regi, qui ſi ob levem impenſam mille et quingentarum marcarum (quæ adæquantur mille libris ſterlingicis) eo nomine erogandam, occaſionem adeo propitiam neglexiſſet, regio nomine et titulo fuiſſet omnino indignus. Imo conſtat, propenſo erga literas animo fuiſſe Henricum, quum et Collegium Etonenſe fundaverit, et regii apud Cantabrigienſes jecerit fundamenta, et medios etiam inter tumultus duobus Collegiis Oxoniæ, ubi prima olim ſcientiarum elementa imbiberat, largitiones fecerit [EE].

Tertium argumentum inde infertur, quod Guil. Caxtonus, qui Weſtmonaſterium a. 1474, artem attulit, eam didicerit Coloniæ, quo iter porrigere ei haud opus erat, ſi exercita illa tunc Oxoniæ fuiſſet. At vero parum id ſtringit, ſi vitæ rationem Caxtoni perpendamus. Hic enim ipſe in præfatione *Hiſtoriæ Trojanæ* [FF], cujus interpretationem Anglicam Brugis 1 Martii 1468 cœpit, Gandavi proſecutus eſt, et Coloniæ 19 Sept. 1471 finivit, ſuiſque porro typis a. 1472, vel ſeq. hac ipſa (ut probabile eſt) in urbe impreſſit, teſtatur, ſe per triginta annos maximam temporis partem in Belgio tranſegiſſe, imo addictum fuiſſe aliquamdiu aulæ Margaretæ, Burgundiæ ducis, et ſororis Edvardi IV. Angliæ regis.

[EE] See Twyne, in *Apoloq. pro Antiq. Oxon* lib. III. § 174. ſeq. Ant. Wood. *dict. lib.* tom I. p. 224.

Nemo

ſubjects from the exerciſe of printing, which he repreſented to the King; who, had he neglected ſo favourable an opportunity, for fear of the ſmall expence of 1500 marks (equal to 1000 *l.* ſterling) requeſted of him for that purpoſe, would have been utterly unworthy of the name and title of King. Nay, it appears that Henry was an encourager of literature, ſince he founded Eton College, laid the foundation of King's College, Cambridge; and even in the midſt of the tumultuous times gave large gifts to two Colleges at Oxford, where he had formerly been taught the firſt principles of the ſciences [EE].

A third argument is inferred from hence, that William Caxton, who brought the art to Weſtminſter in 1474, learnt it at Cologne, to which place his journey would have been unneceſſary if it was then exerciſed at Oxford. But that avails little, if we attend to Caxton's way of life. For he himſelf teſtifies, in the preface to his *Hiſtorye of Troy* [FF], (the Engliſh tranſlation of which he began at Bruges March 1, 1468, carried it on at Ghent, and finiſhed it at Cologne on the 19th of Sept. 1471;) that, in 1472, or the following year, he printed it with his own types, and moſt probably in that city: that he ſpent the greateſt part of thirty years in the Netherlands, and even reſided ſome time in the palace of Margaret dutcheſs of Burgundy, ſiſter to Edward IV. of England.

at the Court

[FF] *Recuyel of the Hiſtoryes of Troy*, by Raoul le Fevre. See Lewis, p. 2. and Ames, p. 2.

Every

Nemo igitur eſt, qui non videat, ipſi in Flandria degenti oportunius fuiſſe, Coloniam Agrippinam quam trans mare Oxoniam currere, ut typographiæ principiis innutriretur. Sed aderat præterea ſpecialis ratio. Corſellius, qui operarius fuerat Harlemi, non aliam artem inferre potuit Oxoniam, niſi quam apud Batavos didicerat, nempe ſculptis, ligneis cum maxime, characteribus. Hæc vero ſculptura res erat immenſi laboris. Caxtonus itaque, poſt divulgatam a. 1462 per Moguntinæ officinæ operarios fuſoriam artem, hanc ſibi addiſcendam vidit, ut in re typographica Oxonienſes vinceret; quod mente agitans Germanos adire debuit. Simili plane ratione, atque Theodoricus Martini, natione Belga, novam artem in Germania, Galliaque didicit, inque patriam intulit etſi vetus antea in officina Laurentiana exerceretur [GG]. Caxtonus itaque pari etiam ſubſcriptione, quæ novum typographiæ genus extollebatur [HH], atque Th. Martini ſocius Jo. de Weſtphalia [II], in libris ſuis uſus eſt.

Quartum argumentum Middletono ſuppeditavit diligentiſſimus antiquarius Jo. Lelandus, a. 1552 fato functus [KK], quando *Gul. Caxodunum* (Caxton) vocavit

[GG] Compare *Orig. Typogr.* cap. V. § 1.

[HH] See, at the end of the above quoted *Hiſtories of Troy*, what is ſaid by Lewis, p. 6. and Ames, p. 4.

[II] See MAITTAIRE, *Annal.* tom. I. p. 346, ſeq.

[KK] Compare THO. TANNER's *Bibliothecæ Britanno-Hibern.*

Every body, therefore, muſt acknowlege, that it was more convenient for one who reſided in Flanders to procure inſtruction in the rudiments of printing at Cologne, than to croſs the ſea to Oxford for it. But there was a ſtill more particular reaſon for this. Corſellis, who was a workman at Harleim, could bring no other art to Oxford than what he had learnt in Holland, namely, cut types, and thoſe chiefly wooden ones. But ſuch ſort of cutting was a work of immenſe labour. Caxton, therefore, after the art of caſting was divulged in 1462 by the workmen of Mentz, ſaw the neceſſity of learning it perfectly, that he might excel the Oxford printers; and therefore thought it neceſſary to go to Germany. It was without doubt the ſame reaſon that induced Theodore Martin, a Dutchman, to learn the new art in Germany and France, and transfer it to his own country, though Laurentius had printed there long before [GG]; and Caxton adopted the ſame ſort of colophon, to recommend the new mode of printing [HH], which Theodore Martin, the aſſociate of John of Weſtphalia [II], had uſed in the books he communicated to the publick.

The induſtrious LELAND, who died in 1552 [KK], has furniſhed Middleton with a fourth argument, by calling *Gul. Caxodunum* (Caxton) the *firſt printer in*

Hibern. p. 575, ſeq. Other writers alſo, who are cited by Middleton, have ſaid the ſame as Leland; but as theſe are all of the laſt century, their authority ſeems of little weight.

vocavit *Angliæ prototypographum* [LL]. Sed illud quidem, ut Corſellium ex antiquiori poſſeſſione dejicere poſſit, verendum non eſt. Quam in rem non utar vel Jo. Bagfordi ſolutione [MM], qui primos codices impreſſos in genere Corſellio, at Anglica lingua editos Caxtono tribuit, quoniam perquam jejuna mihi videtur; vel ingenioſiore Proſp. Marchantii conciliatione [MM*], qui dum Corſellium principem Angliæ typographam ſtatuit, quod primos illic libros impreſſiſſet, eundem tamen titulum Caxtono alio ſenſu adſcribi poſſe credidit, quod hujus opera atque induſtria (nam per Caxtonum ac Turnourum Harlemo ſeductus Corſellius et in Angliam tranſvectus eſt) typographia ad Britannos pervenerit. Quum enim alibi Lelandus [NN] ſcripſerit, Caxtonum *primum Londini artem exercuiſſe typographicam*; exiſtimo, hunc ſcriptorem metropolin Angliæ habuiſſe pro prima hujus regni urbe typographica. Sed nodus, ut ego puto, latet in intellectu vocabuli *artis impreſſoriæ*, ſeu *typographicæ*, per quam veteres intellexere artem typis æneis imprimendi, ut ſuo loco oſtendi [OO]. Et ita Lelandus hac locutione non excluſit anteriores impreſſiones, typis ligneis a Corſellio factas; perinde atque inſcriptio ſepulchralis Theod. Martini, a me producta [PP], nihil vel adimit

[LL] *Lib. de ſcriptoribus Britanniæ*, cap. 586. p. 480.

[MM] This HEARNE relates, from MARCHANT's MſS. in his *Not. ad* GUL. NEUBRIGENSIS *Hiſt. Ang.* vol. III. p. 744. edit. Oxon. 1719.

vel

England [LL]. But there is little danger of this argument's operating against the prior claim of Corsellis; in whose defence I shall neither have recourse to Bagford's solution [MM], who supposes Corsellis to have been the earliest printer in England, but that Caxton was the first who printed in the English language, as I cannot think it at all satisfactory; nor to Prosper Marchant's more ingenious way of reconciling the matter [MM*], who, whilst he allows Corsellis to have been the first printer in England, because he printed the first books there, thinks nevertheless the same title ought to be applied in another sense to Caxton, since by his labour and industry printing came to the Britons (for Corsellis was seduced from Harleim, and brought over into England by Caxton and Turner). And when Leland [NN] observes in another place that Caxton *began printing* first at London, I imagine he considered the metropolis of England as the first typographical city in the kingdom. But I suppose the difficulty lies in the expression *printing*, or *typographical art*, by which, as I have shewn [OO], metal types were originally understood. So that Leland, by the phrase he used, no more excluded the earlier impressions by Corsellis with wooden types; than the monumental inscription which I have exhibited of Theodore Martin [PP] diminishes

[MM*] *Hist. de l'Imprim.* part. II. p. 122.
[NN] LELAND, *ubi sup.* cap. 505. p. 423.
[OO] *Orig. Typog.* cap. VII. § 3.
[PP] Ibid. cap. V. not. *e*.

vel minuit monumentis officinæ Laurentianæ literariis.

Minoris momenti eſt, quod infertur quinto loco ex epigraphe, ſubjecta Phalaridis *epiſtolis*, per Franc. Aretinum tranſlatis, edit. Oxon. circa a. 1485, quam integram apponere utile erit:

Hoc Teodoricus Rood, quem Collonia miſit,
Sanguine Germanus, nobile preſſit opus;
Atque ſibi ſocius Thomas fuit Anglicus Hunte.
Dii dent, ut Venetos exuperare queant.
Quam Jenſon Venetos docuit vir Gallicus artem,
Ingenio didicit terra Britanna ſuo.
Celatos Veneti nobis tranſmittere libros
Cedite, nos aliis vendimus, O Veneti.
Quæ fuerat vobis ars primum nota Latini,
Eſt eadem nobis ipſa reperta preſens*.
Quamvis ſejunctos toto canit orbe Britannos
Virgilius, placet his lingua Latina tamen.

Verſiculo ſexto indicari Middletonus putat, artem in Anglia non ab extero, verum indigena, primum exercitam, qualem fuiſſe Corſellium haud liquet, Caxtonum conſtat [QQ]. At vero totus contextus probat, verba hæc interpretationem literalem haud pati, quia ſic innuerent, artem Venetos quidem ab extero, Nic. Jenſone, primum didiciſſe, Britannos autem proprio excogitaſſe ingenio; quod utrumque repugnat veritati. Nam Jenſoni, qui imprimere cœpit Venetiis a. 1470, jam biennio illic præceſ-

[QQ] Lewis inform us, from Caxton's own words, that he was born in Kent.

* This word, contracted in the original, is lengthened by Dr. Middleton into *premens*. See above, p. 31.

ſerat

the literary memorials of Laurentius's printing-office.

The fifth argument is of ſtill leſs conſequence. It ariſes from the colophon annexed to Phalaris's *Epiſtles*, tranſlated by Francis Aretine, publiſhed at Oxford about 1485, the whole of which it may be proper to tranſcribe:

"Theodoric Rood, a native of Germany, ſent "from Cologne, printed this noble work; with the "aſſiſtance of Thomas Hunte, an Engliſhman. Hea-"ven grant, that they may excel the Venetians! That "art, which Jenſon, a Frenchman, taught the Vene-"tians, Britain learnt by its own ingenuity. For-"bear, ye Venetians, to tranſmit to us your ſtamped "books; we now can ſell them to others. That "ſkill in the Latin tongue, which was firſt known to "you, is at this time diſcovered by us. Though "Virgil ſings that the Britons were ſeparated from "the reſt of the world, yet they now delight in the "Latin language."

Middleton thinks it is clearly implied in the ſixth verſe, that the art's being firſt practiſed in England not by a foreigner, but a native, could not allude to Corſellis, but evidently to Caxton [QQ]. Yet the whole context proves that the words will not bear this literal meaning, becauſe, if ſo, they would imply that the Venetians firſt learnt the art from Nicholas Jenſon a foreigner, and that the Britons diſcovered it by their own ingenuity; whereas in both caſes the fact was otherwiſe;

ſerat Joannes de Spira [RR]. Britannis autem ſive Corſellium ſive Caxtonum primum impreſſorem demus, utrumque extra Angliam didiciſſe artem certum eſt. Quum vero de Jenſone ipſi ſcripſerint veteres, eum ceteros eleganti imprimendi ratione viciſſe [SS], mens Poëtæ mihi quidem videtur perſpicua; quod ſicut Veneti hanc typographiæ perfectionem extero, nempe Jenſoni, debebant, ita Angli proprio ingenio artem ad ſimilem gradum evexerint; unde etiam *cælatos* ab his libros dixit, ut impreſſionum elegantiam exprimeret. Ita vero extollere auctor voluit non primum Britanniæ typographum, ſed impreſſorem opuſculi Thomam Hunte, Anglum; utpote quem jam optaverat, fore, ut cum ſocio Theod. Roodio ipſos aliquando ſuperaret Venetos: qua in parte ſi cui aqua porro hæreat, hunc perſimile

Nic.

[RR] The Chronicle-writer of Cologne has told us, that books were printed at Venice before Jenſon came thither. See Append. N. 5.; nay, more, Spira himſelf affirms, in the colophon to CICERO's *Epiſtolæ ad Familiares*, 1469, that he himſelf was the firſt printer at Venice; whence it is very certain, that the title of the book, called *Decor puellarum*, and aſcribed to Nic. Jenſon in 1461 (which indeed Schelhorn, in *Not. ad lib. Card. Quirini*, p. 100. ſuſpects to be corruptly added with a pen) is faulty, and ſhould be read 1471, which Middleton likewiſe acknowleges, and which is afterwards further confirmed by CL. DE BOZE, tom. XIV. *des Memoires de l'Acad. des Inſcript.* part I. p. 232. JOS. ANT. SAXIUS, in *Hiſt. Typogr. Mediol. in Prolegom.* p. 78, & ſeq.

otherwise; for John de Spira [RR] was at Venice two years earlier than Jenson, who began to print there in 1470. But whether we allow Corsellis or Caxton to have been the first printer amongst the Britons, it is certain they both acquired the art out of England. And since antient writers have mentioned Jenson as surpassing others in the elegance of his printing [SS], the poet's meaning appears quite clear to me: that as the Venetians were indebted to Jenson, a foreigner, for their perfect knowledge of printing, so the English arrived at an equal degree of excellence by their natural ingenuity; on which account he terms their books *engraved*, denoting thereby the elegance of the impressions. It was not, therefore, this author's intentions to celebrate the person who introduced the art into Britain; but the printer of a small work, Thomas Hunte, an Englishman, as a person whom he hoped, in conjunction with Theodoric Rood, might at some period excel the Venetians. If this solution should not be thought satisfactory, a similar testi-

& seq. and the Author of *Catalogus Bibliothecæ Smithianæ*, p. 116.

[SS] See the words which I introduced from OMNIBONUS's Preface to QUINTILIAN 1471, cap. I. *Orig.* § 5. *in not.* I will now add a similar passage, from BENED. BROGNOLI's Preface to DIOG. LAERT. 1475. *Omitto, quod cum multi sint impressores in hac excellentissima in omni rerum genere civitate, ab eo videbam Diogenem imprimendam esse, qui sine controversia ceteris omnibus ejus artificii magistris multum etiam anticedit, Nicolao Jensoni.*

mony

Nic. Gupalatini testimonium de Clementis Patavini impressionibus omnino convincet [TT].

Sexto argumento conjungere licebit, quæ ex silentio ipsius Gul. Caxtoni, Math. Parkeri, scriptorum porro Belgii nostri, et Gul. Prynne de hac historia, ducuntur objectiones; quandoquidem hujusmodi argumentationes ex logices principiis constat perquam esse infirmas.

Caxtonus scilicet suæ *Polychronici* continuationi, quam perduxit ad finem regni Henrici VI. ne verbum quidem de hac expeditione immiscuit; imo origines impressoriæ artis repetiit Moguntia, quod Middletoni opinione non fecisset, si ipse Corsellium Harlemo conduxisset ad Anglos [UU]. Sed hæc nihil aliud probant, quam Caxtonum omisisse historiæ suæ inserere, quæ ad prima artis incunabula spectant; id vero ipsi cum omnibus ejus ævi chronographis commune

[TT] The words are in Mesua's Preface *De medicinis universalibus*, published at Venice 1471. *Verum tamen hac in re me palam profiteri minime pudebit, ita quoque hanc artem, ut pleraque alibi inventa, cum in Italiam traducta fuerint, politiorem excultioremque factam esse. Cujus rei sane clarissimum exemplum præbet libri hujus eleguntissimus impressor Clemens Patavinus, sacerdos bonus, virque non solum litterarum studiis apprime eruditus, sed et omnium, quos unquam novi, in dedaleo praesertim et manuali opere ingeniosissimus. Nam cum neminem tale artificium operantem unquam prospexerit, suo perspicaci ingenio, elementis quibusdam tantum hujus artis perceptis, reliqua consummatissime reperiens; Italorum primus libros hac arte formavit.*

mony of Nicholas Gupalatinus in praiſe of the impreſſions of Clemens Patavinus will furniſh a convincing corroboration [TT].

In ~~To~~ the ſixth argument, may be applied ſuch objections as ariſe from the ſilence of WILLIAM CAXTON, MATTHEW PARKER, the Dutch writers, and WILLIAM PRYNNE, concerning this ſtory; for ſuch kind of reaſoning is very weak when it depends merely on logical principles. included

Caxton did not inſert a ſingle word of this voyage in the continuation of his *Polychronicon*, which he carried down to the end of the reign of Henry VI; nay, he derived the origin of printing from Mentz, which in Middleton's opinion he could not have done had he brought Corſellis from Harleim into England [UU]. But theſe things prove nothing more, than that Caxton omitted to inſert in his hiſtory what related to the infancy of the art; which was no uncommon practice with all the hiſtorians of that age.

formavit. How exactly then did Thomas Hunte the Engliſhman reſemble Clemens Patavinus, ſince both of them, having learnt only the firſt rudiments of the art, practiſed it afterwards by their own ingenuity! [See what has been before ſaid, p. 38.]

[UU] As Caxton's chriſtian name was not expreſſed in the extract from the manuſcript, I have ſometimes doubted whether he and the Weſtminſter printer were the ſame perſon: for though it be there added, that he went to Holland as a trader, the ſame might alſo be applied to Richard Caxton, a merchant of London, who flouriſhed about the ſame time, if what Palmer writes, p. 139, be true. But this man's fictions have evidently appeared in numberleſs inſtances.

mune fuit. Et profecto, ſalva Middletoni ſententia, longe magis mirandum eſt, Caxtonum neque in hoc chronico, neque in ullis librorum, quos excudit, præfationibus, ubi de ſe peregrinationibuſque ſuis haud raro verba fecit, ſe ipſum tradidiſſe primum Angliæ typographum. Ut adeo Caxtoni hac de re ſilentium Middletoni cauſam jugulet potius, quam firmet [XX]. Quod vero artem impreſſoriam adſcripſerit Moguntiæ, reſtringendum ad typos metallicos certiſſimum eſt; neque hac in parte quidquam e propria penu Caxtonus attulit, deſcribens tantummodo Faſciculum temporum ab Henrico Wirzburg de Vach interpolatum, uti poſt Caxtonum ab aliis quoque factum [YY].

Parkerum bona fide arbitror, origines artis in Angla omnino ignoraſſe; unde ex ejus ſilentio non magis enervatur preli tranſlatio Harlemo ad Oxonienſes per Corſellium, quam Colonia ad Weſtmonaſterienſes per Caxtonum, quam in dubium vocat nemo. In typographiæ originibus quam parum verſatus fuerit Parkerus, ipſe prodit, dum Argentorato inventionem adſcribit tempore Bourcherii Archiep. Cantuar, adeoque poſt a. 1454, quod a veritate tam longe abeſt, ut mea refutatione non egeat.

Belgicos

[XX] Middleton urges, that Caxton, in his colophons, ſpeaks of printing, in the way which it w s natural for one to do who had introdu ed a new art from foreign countries. And this he might do with propriety, as he was the firſt prin-

And indeed, with deference to Middleton's judgment, it is much rather to be wondered at, that Caxton ſhould not have taken notice, either in this Chronicle, or in any of the prefaces of the books he printed, wherein he frequently mentions himſelf and his travels, that he was the earlieſt printer in England. So that Caxton's ſilence on this head rather hurts Middleton's cauſe, than eſtabliſhes it [XX]. As to his aſcribing the art of printing to Mentz, it moſt certainly ſhould be reſtrained to metal types; neither has Caxton, in this narrative, given any thing as from himſelf, but has merely repeated what he found in the interpolated edition of the *Faſciculus temporum* by Henry Wirczburg de Vach; and the ſame has been ſince repeated by ſubſequent writers [YY].

I verily think, Parker was quite ignorant of the origin of the art in England; ſo that the importation of the preſs from Harleim to Oxford by Corſellis is no more weakened from his ſilence, than Caxton's bringing it from Cologne to Weſtminſter, of which there is no doubt. Parker himſelf betrays how little he was acquainted with the origin of printing, when he aſcribed the invention of it to Stratſburg, in the time of Bourcher Archbiſhop of Canterbury, even later than 1454, which is ſo far from being true, that it needs no refutation.

ter at London, or, more properly ſpeaking, at Weſtminſter.

[YY] See *Append. Meermanni Docum.* N. 24 et 25.

Belgicos ſcriptores de hac hiſtoria ſiluiſſe mirandum non eſt, quod illa Anglorum quidem reſpectu memorabilis, at Batavorum leviſſimi momenti eſſet, horumque gloriæ nihil vel adderet vel detraheret. Imo, qui de inventione artis Harlemi, ejuſque ad Moguntinos migratione omnino tacuerant, cur aliquid ſcripſiſſent de tranſlatione diu poſthac ad Anglos facta? Hadr. Junio autem ſufficiebat, priori de re verba facere, quod aſſertionem Moguntinorum, artem impreſſoriam ſibi vindicantium, infringere Batavorum cauſam, etſi perperam, exiſtimaret. At quum Britanni nunquam ſibi inventum aſcripſiſſent, ſcrupuloſe inquirere ipſi haud opus erat, qua ratione artem illi mutuati eſſent ab Harlemenſibus; quæ ignoraſſe Junium arbitror.

E teſtimonio Guilielmi Prynne, in cauſa a. 1642, agitata, vereor, ut inferri poſſit, hiſtoriam Corſellii fuiſſe tunc incognitam. Lis quippe erat typographos inter, et ſingulari privilegio a rege donatos. Illorum jura quum defenderet Prynnius, ad auctoritatem Mſ. Lambethani fruſtra provocaſſet, unde alia omnia elici poterant. Pro fundamento itaque poſuit, typographiam per Caxtonum primum advectam in Angliam, provocans ſine dubio ad Lelandi aliorumque teſtimonia. Qui vero privilegium a rege impetraverant, probabiliter ſeſe, ut jus typographiæ regale defenderent, munivere teſtimonio hujus Mſ. quod jam a. 1608 cognitum fuiſſe ex Twyni verbis collegi.

It is no wonder that the Dutch writers ſhould be ſilent in this matter, becauſe, though it was a remarkable circumſtance to the Engliſh, it was to them of little conſequence, and could neither increaſe nor diminiſh their credit. And indeed why ſhould they, who make no mention of the invention of the art at Harleim, or of its migration to Mentz, write any thing concerning its much later tranſlation into England *? It was ſufficient for Hadrian Junius's purpoſe juſt to mention, as it were in paſſing, that the very claim of the people of Mentz to the invention of the art was an injury to the Hollanders; but, as the Engliſh had never aſſumed the merit of the invention, there could be no occaſion to enter into a minute inquiry by what means they had borrowed the art from Harleim, and which, I am of opinion, Junius did not know.

I apprehend it cannot be inferred, from the teſtimony of William Prynne in the cauſe agitated in 1642, that Corſellis's hiſtory was then unknown: for the conteſt was between the company of ſtationers and certain perſons furniſhed with a ſingular privilege from the king. When Prynne defended the ſtationers, he would appeal in vain to the authority of the Lambeth manuſcript, whence all the others muſt be taken; he therefore aſſumed as his groundwork that printing was at firſt brought into England by Caxton, appealing doubtleſs to the teſtimony of Leland and others. But thoſe who had obtained the royal patent, in order to defend the crown's ſupremacy over printing, armed themſelves probably with

* Yet ſurely it would have proved much for the Harlemites, that the early ſtealers were forced to do ſo from them.

collegi. Ejus ergo documenti non authenticitati quidem (a nemine in dubium tunc vocatæ) sed fidei historicæ detrahere quum e re esset Prynnii, scribit, *adversarios* (qui nempe artem ad Oxonienses sumtibus regiis primum pervenisse ope hujus Ms. statuebant) *circa translationem artis in Angliam errorem commisisse*; ipse interea non animadvertens, utramque et auctoris Ms. Lambethani et Lelandi traditionem veram esse, dum ille artem impressoriam latiore, hic strictiore sensu intellexit. Atque ita commodam interpretationem recipiunt verba Prynnii, quæ obscura tibi, v. cl. visa sunt.

Quod porro spectat decisionem in causa, inter Academiam Cantabrigiensem et typographum regium ante paucos annos agitata *, recte omnino huic homini privilegium exclusivum libro juridicos edendi abjudicavit Curia, quum nusquam locorum typographia regalibus annumerata fuerit. At si eadem Curia simul rejecit auctoritatem Ms. Lambethani, ita sine dubio judicavit, quod Middletoni argumenta vim persuadendi apud eam invenissent, indeque pro spurio haberetur, quod produci amplius in archetypo haud poterat, documentum.

Quod tamen Corsellii nomen incognitum statuis in Anglia aut seculum XVII. ipse, v. cl. satis perspicis supponere, Corselli typographi ad Oxonienses iter esse imaginarium, quod nos inter controversum

* See what has been already said on this subject in the note on p. 196. N.

est.

the testimony of the manuscript, which (as I infer from Twyne's words) was known in 1608. Therefore as it could be of no service to Prynne to invalidate the authenticity of the MS. (which was not then called into dispute) but rather the historical fact, he asserts, that the *adverse party* (namely, those who on the faith of this MS. contended that the art came first to Oxford at the king's expence) *had committed an error in their account of the art's being transferred into England*; he in the mean time not considering, that the accounts of the author of the Lambeth manuscript and of Leland were reconcileable, as the former understood the art in a more extensive, and the latter in a more confined sense. And thus, Prynne's words, which before appeared obscure to you, receive a proper explanation.

Moreover, with regard to the decision in the cause between the university of Cambridge and the king's printer, which was agitated a few years ago, the court was certainly right in abrogating the exclusive privilege of publishing law-books, as it could not anywhere be found that printing was part of the royal prerogative. And if the same court rejected the authority of the Lambeth manuscript, it without doubt was from a supposition that Middleton's arguments were sufficiently forcible to determine the copy to be spurious, since it was unaccompanied by the original.

Your concluding at last that Corsellis's name was unknown in England before the 17th century, is evidently taking it for granted that the journey of Corsellis the printer to Oxford was only imaginary, which

est. Quid quod in re ipsa quoque lapsus sis, quum Corsellii cujusdam ex Anglia ignominiose ejecti ad a. 1586, meminerit Guil. Camdenus [ZZ]. Imo nomen hoc gentilitium ævo xv, quo decantata illa accidit historia, non incelebre erat [AAA]; quandoquidem Thomas de Corsellis, Theologiæ magister, et Canonicus Ambianensis in Gallia, orator exstitit in Concilio Basileensi a. 1434, seq. de quo multa retulit Æneas Sylvius [BBB]. Uti etiam a. 1461, hujus frater vel certe agnatus Hugo de Corselle prætor fuit urbis Ambiani [CCC]. Uti vero plerique isto proximoque seculo de majoribus suis parum solliciti erant, ita nemo mirabitur, Nicolaum Corsellis, qui genealogiam suam a. 1664. Heraldicæ artis præfecto tradidit, latuisse gradus, quibus ab impressore Friderico ipse distabat, atque ita, quum adscendere non posset ad tempora adeo remota, contentum fuisse originem repetere a patre Zeagano, qui e Flandria in Angliam

[ZZ] *Annal. rer. Angl. regnante Elizabetha*, tom. II. p. 406. published by Thomas Hearne.

[AAA] This family, I imagine, was properly named *de Courcelles*, or *Courselles*, and derived their origin from the countries bordering on Flanders. It is certain, that Jacob occurs in a writing there in 1215, and Wm. de Courcelles, knt in 1340. See JOH. LE CARPENTIER, *Hist. Geneal. de Cambray*, part III. p. 245 et 601. Also at Liege, in the 16th century, and beginning of the 17th, flourished Peter Christian de Courselle, a counsellor, and his son Gerard Corsell, afterwards doctor of civil law in Louvain. See VALER.

which is the matter in dispute between us. But here I shall demonstrate that you are wrong, as William Camden [ZZ] takes notice of one Corcellis, who was ignominiously banished from England in the year 1586. Nay, this family-name was in no small repute [AAA] in the 15th century, when the transaction we are talking about happened; Thomas de Corsellis, a divine, and canon of Amiens in France, concerning whom Æneas Sylvius has recorded many things [BBB], was a speaker in the council of Basil in 1434 and the following year, and in 1461, his brother, or at least his kinsman, Hugo de Corselles, was chief magistrate of Amiens [CCC]. But as many in that and the following age were not solicitous about their ancestry, so it need not be wondered at, that Nicolas Corsellis, who took his genealogy from the Heralds office in 1664, should have been ignorant of the number of degrees by which he descended from Frederick the printer; and therefore, as he could not trace so far back as those remote times, he was contented to derive his origin from his father Zeagan, who emigrated from Flanders into England; although

VALER. ANDREAS, in *Fast. Acad. Lovan.* p. 202. edit. 1650. and in *Biblioth. Belg.* p. 347. published by FOPPENS. Many of this name occur likewise in the *Recueil Heraldique des Bourguemaitres de Liege*, published at Liege in 1720. But Zeagan Corsellis, of whom we shall speak presently, was originally of Flanders.

[BBB] *Lib.* I. *Commentar. de hoc Concilio.*

[CCC] *Vide le Pere de* DAIRE, *Hist. de la Ville d'Amiens.* edit. Par. 1757, tom. I. p. 79.

Angliam migraverat; etſi Friderici oblitus deinde haud fuerit Joannes Corſellis in inſcriptione ſepulchrali Nicolao erecta a. 1674.

Sic igitur afferuiſſe atque ab objectionibus liberaſſe mihi videor Oxonienſis typographiæ præ reliquis Angliæ vetuſtatem: quam etſi cauſam veritatis potiſſimum amore incitatus ſuſceperim defendendam, non parum tamen gaudeo, aliquod grati animi teſtimonium proferre mihi licuiſſe erga illuſtriſſimam hanc urbem atque academiam, ubi tot humanitatis officia ſemel iterumque expertus ſum, quum a. 1756, nobiliſſima Comitiſſa de Pontefracto ob eximium antiquorum marmorum donum, proximoque triennio novus Cancellarius, vir ill. Joannes, Weſtmorlandiæ comes, acclamationibus et feſtivitatibus juſſu univerſitatis exciperetur; atque hac occaſione d. 3 Julii 1759, in frequentiſſima auditorum, ipſiuſque ſexus elegantioris, corona, doctoris gradum in jure civili honoris cauſa obtinerem. Neque enim leve illi profecto civitati videri poteſt, ſi, quæ a tot retro ſeculis ſcientiarum altrix jam exſtiterat, prima etiam apud Britannos artis, literarum propagatricis, fuiſſe probetur fautrix. At erunt fortaſſe, qui aliter ſentientes non omnino ad liquidum perductam rem exiſtimabunt: proinde æquum eſt, ut controverſiam hanc eorum porro ſubmittamus judicio, quibus jus ſuffragii eſt. Hos inter vero nominari cum maxime velim

John Corſellis was not afterwards unmindful of Frederick on the monumental inſcription of Nicolas's tomb-ſtone *, erected in 1674.

Thus, therefore, I preſume I have afferted the antiquity of printing to Oxford preferably to all other places in England, and cleared it from all objections; and although I was chiefly induced for the ſake of truth to undertake this defence of it, I feel notwithſtanding no ſmall pleaſure in having an opportunity of giving ſome token of my gratitude to this moſt famous city and univerſity, where I have repeatedly experienced ſo many kind offices; when, in 1756, the moſt noble counteſs of POMFRET, for her valuable preſent of ancient marbles, and three years afterwards, when the moſt noble JOHN earl of WESTMORLAND was received as Chancellor with acclamations and entertainments by order of the univerſity; on which occaſion, July 3, 1759, amidſt a numerous aſſembly, particularly of the fair ſex, I obtained the honorary degree of Doctor of civil law. For indeed it would prove no ſmall honour to this city, if ſhe, who for ſo many centuries paſt has been the cultivator of the ſciences, ſhould alſo prove the firſt encourager amongſt the Britons of that art, which is the propagator of literature. But there may ſtill be ſome of different ſentiments, who may think the matter is not perfectly cleared up: it is therefore but juſt, that this controverſy ſhould be ſubmitted to the deciſion of competent judges. Amongſt theſe, I would princi-

* See above, p. 163; the inſcription is in p. 191. N.

vel. reverendissimum illum in Christo patrem, Thomam Seckerum, Cantuariensem Archiepiscopum, cujus eruditionem, candorem, atque humanitatem, multis modis comprobatam mihi, suspexi cominus, sæpiusque imitandam aliis proposui. Huic interea Præsuli dignissimo ut salutem meo nomine impertiaris plurimam, tibique etiam me semper habeas commendatissimum, oro quæsoque.

Dab. Roterodami, mense Dec. MDCCLXI.

pally mention the moſt reverend father in God THOMAS SECKER, archbiſhop of Canterbury, whoſe learning, candour, and civility, I have cloſely admired, and frequently propoſed to the imitation of others. And I earneſtly intreat, that, whilſt you preſent my beſt good wiſhes to this moſt worthy prelate, you will be aſſured of my reſpectful eſteem for yourſelf.

Written at Rotterdam, Dec. MDCCLXI.

Copy

Copy of a Letter transcribed by Mr. BAKER, of St. John's College, Cambridge, from the original of Mr. JOHN LAUGHTON. (Harl. MSS. 7043. 33.) Never before printed.

Amsterdam, June 23, 1699.

I MADE some stay at Harleim, to visit Van Dalen, whose learned piece about oracles you have seen. He received me with abundance of humanity, and shewed me all his collections of antiquities, which are extremely curious. He introduced me to a young lady there, born deaf and dumb, yet taught to speak and read very intelligibly both Dutch and Latin. Her name is Ester Koolart, and her preceptor Dr. Amand, a German. She is an only child of a very rich merchant. Her mother speaks Latin elegantly, and understands Greek perfectly. I was very desirous of seeing the first book printed here by Costerus, of which we have had very false accounts. It is kept in a chest in the Stadthouse; and the masters keep the key, which we procured, and found it to be, not Tully's Offices, or Virgil, as was reported, and is shewn in Benet-Library at Cambridge; but a Dutch piece of Theology *, with cuts, printed only on one side of the paper: and one leaf of Latin, intituled "Liber Vitæ Alexandri Magni;" that seems to be

* The "Horarium," without doubt, described above, p. 66. N.

Monkiſh Latin. Theſe were printed 1430, the year he invented that art, as is ſignified alſo in the inſcription under his picture; whereas Mr. Ray has told the world, from the ſame inſcription, it was 1440, which makes a great difference, and muſt be a great miſtake, and has cauſed many amongſt the writers about this matter. There is bound up in the ſame volume another Dutch piece, printed by Coſterus anno 1432 *.

Under his picture are theſe verſes, not yet extant as I ever ſaw, for which reaſon I begged leave to take them:

Vana quid Archetypos, & Præla Moguntia jactas,
Harlemi Archetypos, Prælaque nata ſcias.
Extulit hic, monſtrante Deo, Laurentius artem,
Diſſimulare virum hunc, diſſimulare Deum eſt †.

* This doth not ſatisfactorily appear. Nobody ſuppoſes that any *printed* date of ſuch antiquity exiſts; and the ſuperficial accounts of travellers are of little conſequence now Meerman has given exact deſcriptions. N.

† This is carrying the compliment *beyond* decency. N.

Since

Since the preceding parts of this little work were given to the publick, I have been favoured by Dr. DUCAREL with the following Letter of Dr. TAYLOR, on the subject of the Paris Bible, which has been spoken of in p. 107. and 171 *.

To the Right Honourable EDWARD Earl of OXFORD.

MY LORD, Cambridge, Dec. 20, 1740.

THE following account, relating to the Paris Bible of 1464, will not, I presume, be disagreeable to your Lordship, as it serves to clear up a very great difficulty in the History of Printing; and as the fame of this rare and very curious edition I very

* Mr. MAITTAIRE, who had seen a copy of this letter, thus speaks of it in his latest publication on the subject: "Biblia Latina, per *Gering*, *Crantz*, et *Friburger*, fol. "1464. [Palmer's Hist of Printing, p. 160. 102. Annal. I. "5. & 273. & * I. 41.] At vero constat illos Typographos "artem ante annum 1470 non exercuisse [Annal. I. 25. "& * I. 77.] Rectè igitur (uti mihi compertum est ex "epistolâ ad virum nobilem, 1740, Dec. 20, datâ, cujus "exemplar ab amico ad me missum fuit) fraudem detexit "vir in re antiquariâ apprime versatus, & sagaci oculo "locum contemplatus facilè animadvertit duas voces (*semi-*"*lustrum*) fuisse repositas pro veris (*tribus-lustris.*)" Annal. Typogr. Tomi Quinti Pars posterior, p. 565. N.

well

well remember to have excited your Lordſhip's curioſity, it will be no longer a ſubject of wonder, that your Lordſhip's commiſſions over all Europe for a copy of this book were returned without ſucceſs, as your Lordſhip will be convinced, from the peruſal of theſe papers, that it could not have happened otherwiſe.

When the library of the late biſhop Moore came to be better known, nothing in that very valuable Collection was more likely to aſtoniſh the curious than a book of the three firſt Paris printers, with a date which not only contradicted the beſt and moſt authentic accounts of the ſettlement of the preſs in that city; but, what is ſtill more amazing, the expreſs teſtimony of thoſe very printers themſelves upon another occaſion. For, my Lord, not only Naudæus, in his addition to the Hiſtory of Lewis XI, and Chevillier, library keeper of the Sorbonne, in his Diſſertation upon the Origin of Printing, have unconteſtably fixed the date of the Paris preſs at 1470; but the edition of the Epiſtles of Gaſparinus Pergamenſis, which was ſet out at Paris the ſame year, is a convincing proof, that this art had not been exerciſed in that part of Europe before this date, as will appear from the colophon:

" Ut Sol lumen, ſic doctrinam fundis in orbem
" Muſarum nutrix Regia Pariſius,
" Hinc propè divinam, tu, quam Germania novit
" Artem ſcribendi, ſuſcipe promerita.
" *Primos* ecce libros, quos hæc induſtria finxit
" Francorum in terris, ædibus atque tuis.

 " Michael,

"Michael, Udalricus, Martinusque Magistri
"Hos impresserunt, ac facient alios."

Thus stood the History of Printing, when the late bishop of Ely procured a Vulgate Bible in Folio, with a colophon that spoke, and that in the name of Michael [Friburger], Ulric [Gering], and Martin [Crantz], the printers, as expresly for 1464, as any other testimony could do for 1470. Your Lordship very well remembers I transcribed it for your Lordship's use a few years ago, at Morgan's instance, and that it stands thus:

"Jam semi undecimus lustrum, Francos Ludovicus
"Rexerat, Ulricus, Martinus, itemque Michael;
"Orti Teutonia hanc mihi composuere figuram."

The owner of the Book, misled by a false chronology (perhaps that of Chevillier, who dates the reign of Lewis XI. from July 1460), ordered his binder to mark his copy on the back with 1463. But as Lewis XI. began his reign, according to the best accounts, one year later, viz. succeeding his father Charles VII. July 1461, and crowned the August following, the true date cannot be higher than January, or February, 1464. About which time therefore we must suppose this book to be printed.

There is another very material difficulty arising from this date, besides the contradictory accounts mentioned above, which I believe none of those have taken notice of, who yet were very sensible of the other; and is this; if we admit of the story of Faustus exposing his new printed books to sale at

Paris

Paris (I cannot indeed admit of the whole upon account of notable absurdities in it), we can scarce allow him to bring those books to market till 1463. For he had finished them at press in Germany but 1462, and that pretty late in the year, viz. the eve of the Assumption (14 August). Now, if ours be a true date, how shall we account for the surprize of the Paris purchasers, which they are said to express at the exact similitude of so many copies that Faustus offered to sale, and at the novelty of an art, of which they had formed no idea (for so the story runs) when they had the very same invention brought home to them some time before, and actually exercised in their own city at the same juncture? For besides the time which must be required in laying-in materials and setting up a printing-house, this very large volume consisting of 240 sheets, which was finished at press but at the beginning of the year 1464, must have required (when the invention was very young, and the press moved heavily) a considerable time longer than the compass of one year to bring it to perfection. Upon shewing this curiosity, a little while ago, to Mr. Maurice Johnson, of Spalding, a gentleman exceedingly well versed in antiquities, he almost immediately cried out that there had been an erazement, and that in those two words which establish the date *semi*, my Lord, is a visible forgery, wrote with the hand in printing-ink on a place that had been scratched with the knife, but otherwise no bad imitation of the type, and except that it borders a little

too close upon the following word, upon the whole a very ingenious counterfeit. The other word *lustrum* (thus *lustrū*) has undergone no alteration but in the last letter, which is very ill connected with the letter preceding, and in a quite different manner from any other part of the book where those two letters meet. Besides, my Lord, that part of the word which remains in print and untouched, betrays upon comparison, and to a very ordinary attention, the imposture at the end of it. When Mr. Palmer wrote the History of Printing, and was led by the nature of his subject to consider the circumstances of bishop Moore's, or the Cambridge Bible, he could by no means get over the difficulty of this colophon, but was forced to cut the knot by saying that probably the gentleman of Cambridge, who transcribed for Maittaire, had mistaken the words, and wrote *semi-lustrum* instead of *tribus-lustris*, which is surely such an Hallucination as I can suppose no man guilty of, who transcribed, and that by way of evidence, three lines for a friend with his eyes open. However, my Lord, Mr. Palmer was not far from the mark, though surely his manner of accounting for the difficulty was the clumsiest of all conjectures, and what must of necessity have been exposed and confuted as often as the book should be laid open. For I will venture to pronounce that this is a copy of the edition of the Bible in 1476, which is what Mr. Palmer alluded to in his *tribus-lustris*, an edition pretty well known, and altogether reconcileable with the testimony of our printers,

printers, and the History of Printing; the colophon of which,

"Jam tribus undecimus lustris Francos Ludovicus
"Rexerat, Ulricus, Martinus, itemque Michael;
"Orti Teutonia hanc mihi composuere figuram."

is either through wantonness, or perhaps an affection of being thought to be the master of a singular copy; or, what is still more likely, out of avarice, transformed into what it is at present; and what has puzzled the most inquisitive for above twenty years last past.

But, my Lord, the colophon of 1476, consists in all of five lines:

"Jam tribus undecimus lustris Francos Ludovicus
"Rexerat, Ulricus, Martinus, itemque Michael;
"Orti Teutonia hanc mihi composuere figuram
"Parisii arte sua, me correctam vigilanter,
"Venalem in vico Jacobi Sol aureus offert."

But as these two last lines might be easily spared, and our impostor was very willing to part with them, since the colophon thus reduced must necessarily set his copy at greater variance from the known edition of 1476: upon a close examination, I found they had been totally erased, and an ordinary piece of illumination drawn over the place, for the beter disguise.

Across this part of the paper, as far as the opposite column, there has formerly been a rent, whether a casual or a designed one, I leave your Lordship to guess; when I add that on the back of the leaf, is pasted

pasted (seemingly in a careless manner) a piece of pretty thick paper, in order to look like restoring what had been torn asunder, but withal so artfully contrived, that it should cloke all that part of the leaf where the erasement had been made.

Yet, my Lord, after all this artifice, the rasure is very plain, when the leaf is held up to the light, especially of those two lines I mentioned, even through the thick paper, which doubtless has no other business there than to come in aid to this notable peice of forgery.

Thus, my Lord, I hope I have satisfactorily accounted for one of the greatest difficulties that have for a long time clogged the annals of the press. That part of literary history has been employed for a considerable time in clearing its way, and getting rid of spurious dates that perplexed its evidences, partly by fraud, and partly accident; of the former sort, I reckon in some measure, the famous Lauderdale Bible, in your Lordship's very valuable collection; a Cicero *de Officiis* of 1465, in the library of Mr. Raymond Kraafft, burgomaster of Ulm, mentioned by Schelhornius, in his *Amœnitates Literariæ*, tom. III. which is altered into 1440. And, lastly, a piece of Thomas Aquinas, printed by Faustus and Scheffer, Anno Domini Millesimo quadringentesimo *Septuagesimo* primo, which being altered by the pen from SEPTUAGESIMO into QUINQUAGESIMO, bears date before the æra of printing. I question not but that time will make more discoveries of this

 sort,

ſort, and that the Decor Puellarum of Nicolas Jenſon in 1461, and Franciſcus Horius *de Amore Camilli et Amiliæ*, ſaid to be printed at Tours in 1467, will be found in one of thoſe two liſts I have been ſpeaking of.

I am,

My Lord, &c.

JOHN TAYLOR, LL.D.

[Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, 1740.]

Extract

Extract of an original Letter from Dr. TAYLOR to Dr. DUCAREL, dated Cambridge, Nov. 2, 1752.

THERE is in the library at Cambridge (*a*), a MS. of the Gospels [*b*] and Acts given us by Theodore Beza about the age you mention: the Codex Claromontanus in the Royal library at Paris, containing the Epistles, is said to be the second volume of that book; but I think without any foundation. The Paris book, though called a Quarto, I am informed, is not properly so, but a small Folio rather, however by all accounts of a different size from ours, which is strictly speaking a Quarto, as far as a parchment-book can be called so. There is one thing that may settle this question upon a near inspection, and it stands thus:

Beza's book is Greek on the left page, and Latin on the right, by which means every leaf on the first side is Latin, on the second Greek. Between the Gospels and Acts this book once contained the Epistles, at least St. John's Epistles; for the leaf which begins the Acts (according to the foregoing account) contains likewise on the first side the end of the last Epistle of St. John in Latin, with this colophon:

(*a*) Qu. If not the Ben'et College library.

(*b*) Dr. Ducarel cannot now, Sept. 12, 1778, remember what that date was.

Explicit

Explicit
Epiſtolæ Johannis III.
Incipit
Actus Apoſtolorum.

Now, if the Codex Claromontanus contains theſe few verſes of the Latin tranſlation of St. John's laſt Epiſtle, it is plain that it is not the counter part of ours:

If it wants thoſe verſes preciſely of the Latin tranſlation, then I think it as plain that it is.

But of this you may read more in Le Long's *Bibliotheca Sacra*, in the Prefaces to the critical editions of the New Teſtament, more eſpecially thoſe of Dr. Mill and Profeſſor Wetſtein.

I am, &c.

J. TAYLOR.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS.

P. 10. What Mr. MEERMAN could not discover, the kind communication of a Friend enables me to relate. The illustrious LODOVICUS was Count of Gruyere in Switzerland, not far distant from Vevay, on the Leman Lake. The family was extinct in the year 1554; and this estate (still renowned throughout Europe for excellent cheeses) was divided between the Cantons of Berne and Friburgh. (*Delices de la Suisse*, tom. iii. p. 54.) The edition of the "Fasciculus Temporum" of 1481 might have been executed in either of the neighbouring cities of Basil or Geneva, into which the art of printing had been already introduced.

P. 22. I have seen some admirable specimens of Chinese *Block Printing* in the uncommonly curious collection of my ingenious friend and schoolfellow GEORGE PERRY, Esq. F. A. S. and one work in particular which demonstrates the indefatigable genius of the Jesuits. It is intituled, "Sinarum Scientia Politico-Moralis, a P. PROSPERO INTOCRETTA, Siculo, Societatis Jesu, in lucem edita." The curiosity of this book, so far as it is connected with the subject of my inquiries, is, that it was printed partly at Canton, and partly at Goa. The licence of the Viceprovincial of the order is dated, "In urbe

 "Quàm

"Quàm Chēu metropoli Sinensi provinciæ Quàm tūm, "die 31 mensis Julii, anni 1667;" about which time, probably, the first part of the book was printed. After a preface printed at Goa with Roman types, there is a second title, viz. "Scientiæ Sinicæ liber "secundus. Chūm medium. Yûm constanter te-"nendum. Versio literalis." Then follow twelve double leaves in Chinese characters, with a Latin version in Roman characters, all cut on blocks in the Chinese mode; and fourteen single leaves in the European manner, in which both the Chinese and the Latin translation are printed with separate types, the Roman characters coarsely cast on metal, the Chinese with separate cut types (apparently *wooden* ones). The volume closes with a life of Confucius in Latin, with several Chinese words interspersed, and the following additional licence: "Goæ, iterum "recognitum, ac in lucem editum die 1 Octobris, "anno 1666. Superiorum permissu." The learned missionary appears, therefore, after his recall from Canton, to have been detained at least two years at Goa; and probably gave directions there himself for the Chinese characters to be cut, to match the blocks he had brought from China; and this, though indifferently executed, effectually answered his purpose.

I should mention many similar curiosities; but am unwilling to anticipate a pleasure which the world of letters may one day receive from the well-directed researches of Mr. Perry, on subjects

which (though they fortunately throw light on these matters of speculative amusement) are of far more permanent and extensive utility.

P. 86. I have seen, in THE BRITISH MUSEUM, a still finer copy of the CATHOLICON, of the same edition as Dr. ASKEW's; and also a copy of the original edition of 1460, in a much smaller and neater type. The latter, however, is imperfect; and the deficient parts supplied by leaves of a subsequent edition.

P. 96. I am informed by the Rev. Mr. TOOKE, that the first printing-office in Russia was established by JOHN BASILIUS, son of IVAN BASILEWITZ.—The names of the first printers were IVAN HODERSON and PETER TIMOFIOFFSOM. After ten years labour, they brought out the Gospels, the Acts, and some of the Epistles. The whole Bible was afterwards printed, by command of ALEXIS MICHAELOWITSCH, *literis Ostrogothicis, secundum istud exemplar* (1581 *editum) correcta.* J. P. KOHLIUS, Historia Codicis Sacri Sclavonici, p. 44.

P. 97. It appears by Dr. VAN TROIL's "Letters "on Iceland, 1780," 8vo. that a printing-office was established there about 1530, by JOHN MATHIESON, a native of Sweden. This office was established at *Hoolum*, or *Hola*, in the North part of the island. The Icelandic Bible was printed in 1584.

P. 137. The doubt about the *large paper* copies of Castell's Lexicon, suggested from M. DE BURE, is easily removed by the slightest inspection of the very

very fine copy on large paper in THE BRITISH MUSEUM, which is the copy that was presented to CHARLES the Second. A second copy is in the LAMBETH Library; and a third, I believe, in the library of the cathedral church of CHICHESTER. There is a tradition, says M. DE BURE, that only *twelve* copies of the Polyglott Bible were printed in that size.

P. 141. The remarkable parenthesis ("præter "eos" &c.) was an after-thought; and is printed-in separately, after the leaf was worked-off. Another little circumstance has never yet been noticed. In p. x. of Bp. WALTON's Preface, "vir illustris Dom. "GAULMINUS eques" is complimented for his assistance; but in some copies this compliment is transferred (by a little piece of printed paper pasted on) to "Dom. HARDIE, linguarum Orientalium peri-"tissimus."

P. 152. I shall without apology enlarge the account of Dr. CASTELL. He was born at Hatley in Cambridgeshire; was admitted of Emanuel College in Cambridge, 1621; and when he undertook the "Lexicon Heptaglotton," admitted himself of St. John's for the sake of the library. Seventeen years were spent by him in this laborious task, on which he bestowed incredible pains and expence, even to the ruin of his constitution and fortune, having expended a considerable patrimony on that work, and reduced himself in 1666 to extreme distress *. In that year, when

* "Socios quidem habui in hoc opere, sed perexiguo tem-"pore mecum in illo commorantes, nescio an dicam, im-"mensitate

when he was overwhelmed with debts, the royal favour began to shine on him; he was made king's chaplain, and Arabic professor at Cambridge. He had published a thin 4to pamphlet in 1660, intituled, "Sol Angliæ Oriens Auspiciis Caroli II. Regum "Gloriosissimi," and adorned with an admirable head of that monarch, inscribed, "Serenissimo & Potentissimo Principi ac Domino Domino Carolo, ejus nominis Secundo, Augustissimo Britanniarum, Franc, &c. &c. Monarchæ, Fidei Defensori, &c. Regi Clementissimo, SOTERIA super Sacratiss. ejus Majestatis incolumitate apud exteros; GRATULATORIA de ejusdem reditu ad suos; VOTIVA pro omnigena Animæ, Corporis ac Regiminis Felicitate, Carmina sua, illis Linguis, quæ in Lexico, quod sub prelo est, Polyglotto Orientali, exhibentur, hu-

"mensitate laboris plane exterritos. Quos diutius retinui, "hi fuerunt; D. M. Murray, Grypswaldensis, vir non "minus doctus, quam admodum ingenuus, cui per sep-"tennii fere spatium Arabicas meas concrediderat collec-"tiones; D. Gul. Beveridgius, vir in secretioribus hisce "literis egregie versatus, per dimidium illius temporis, cura-"bat Syriacas: prout in Æthiopicis per idem tempus operam "impendebat suam M. D. Wanslebius, qui ad perpoli-"endum ejus in iisdem ingenium, in varias Orientis oras "longa atque periculosa suscepit itinera. Per plures annos, "jam ætate provectus, & una cum patrimonio satis com-"petenti, exhaustis etiam animi viribus, oculis caligantibus, "corporis variis in hoc opere confractis & dislocatis mem-"bris, relictus sum solus, sine amanuensi, aut vel correctore "ullo." Dr. CASTELL, Preface to his Lexicon.

"millime

"millime offert, suq & Sociorum nomine, EDMUNDUS "CASTELL, S. T. B." He also materially assisted Bp. WALTON in his celebrated edition of the Polyglott, and is styled in his Lordship's Preface, "Virum in "quo eruditio summa, magnaque animi modestia con-"venere; qui in Samaritanis, Syriacis, Arabicis, & "Æthiopicis, nullam non adhibuit diligentiam; "Cantici Canticorum Æthiopici versionem Latinam "procudit, necnon annotationes doctissimas in eaqun-"dem linguarum versiones elaboravit." These acknowledgements, however, were inadequate to the services of Dr. CASTELL; who translated several books of the New Testament, and the Syriac version of Job where it differs from the Arabic; and, what equally deserved to be recorded, contributed more than a thousand pounds to the expences of the edition *. In 1668, he obtained a prebend of Canterbury. The next year he published his Lexicon; and got the small vicarage of Hatfield Peverell; had afterwards Wodeham Walter rectory; both in Essex; and, towards the close of his life, the rectory of Higham

See also p. 300

* I shall subjoin the words of both: "Viros doctissimos "conquisivi, qui prelorum correctioni & exemplarium quo-"rumdam collationi, &c. invigilantes, mecum continuo "adessent, quibus *Honoraria* pro laboribus exantlatis per-"solvi." Bp. WALTON, Preface.—"*Honorarium* illud quod "in Præfatione Waltoniana dicor accepisse, in illud ipsum "opus non refundebam tantumomne, sed mille, plus minus, "libras, ad promovendum illud, partim ab aliis solicitando "procurabam, partim ipse donabam ultro." Dr. CASTELL, Preface.

Gobyon

Gobyon in Bedfordſhire; where he died in 1685, and was buried in that church; where againſt the North wall of the chancel a tablet of black marble in a white ſtone frame, with a circular pediment terminating in a ſhield and ſupported by two brackets, from which drops a feſtoon encloſing another ſhield, was thus inſcribed in his life-time:

Edmund' Caſtell' S. T. P. regiæ majeſtati Caroli 2i a ſacris eccleſiæ Chriſti Cantuarienſ Canonicus Linguæ Arabicæ apud Cantabrig Profeſſor. regal Societatis ſocius Auth' Lex Heptagl. Necnon Hujus Eccleſiæ Rector Mortalitatis quod reliquum eſt tam ipſi quam lectiſſime ejus Conjugi D^e Elizab. Betteſworth Petri Betteſworth militis aurati primo relictæ, deinde Johani Herris armig (cuj' fil' Wilhelm' una cum filia ej' Elizab. hic jacent) Anno ætatis Edmundi 68 D^e Elizab. 64 anno Chriſti 1674 Vivus hic legat humandum.

جل جاء العدينة لذ ضبل تمن ثلك*

On the upper ſhield quarterly,

1 On a bend 3 cinqfoils
2 A croſs botone
3 A feſs wavy between 2 horſeſhoes
4 In a canton ſiniſter 2 lions paſſant guardant.

Creſt, a caſtle.

On the lower ſhield:

On a bend 3 cinqfoils.

His Oriental manuſcripts he bequeathed to the univerſity of Cambridge, on condition that his name ſhould

ſhould be written on every copy in the collection. His preferments came too late in life to enable him to repair his ſhattered fortune. A great number of his Lexicons (ſuppoſed to be about 500) were unſold at the time of his death. Theſe were placed by Mrs. CRISP, his niece and executrix, in a room in one of her tenant's houſes at *Martin*, in Surrey, where, for many years, they lay at the mercy of the rats, who made ſuch havock among them, that when they came into poſſeſſion of her executors, Dr. —— and Mrs. CRISP (to whoſe ſiſter Mrs. GEST I owe this information), they could ſcarcely make out a compleat volume, and the whole load of learned rags ſold for 7 £ only.

The following original letter from Dr. CASTELL to Dr. SPENCER is communicated to the publick, by the favour of Dr. DUCAREL, from the MS. Library at Lambeth. (MSS. N° 674. p. 26.).

Reverend and moſt highly honoured SIR,

ON Saturday the 9th inſtant, I received a letter from Dr. Marſhall, rector of Lincoln Colledg, Oxford: that very day, the generality heerabouts began the harveſt: that much adoe I had, having no hors of my own, to borrow one til Tueſday following: then I ſet forth to carry you the ſaid letter, about the mid way from my hous to Cambridg I met with Mr. Broughton coming to mee with an expres from you, aſſured mee that my journy would bee to no purpoſe in reference to Golius's library; you had told him, there could be notthing at preſent don about it:

 Wher-

Wherupon we both returned back to my hous: To him I have deliverid the Letter; requeſting after it is read, that he may receive it again of you.

Sir, It is now about, or above ſix years ſince I began to intermedle in this affair, with no other aim but only to ſerve the Univerſity, in which tho I have ſpent not a few hundred, yea thouſands of pounds, yet from it I never received the leaſt kerm of pecuniary profit; my Profeſſorſhip received from another hand, in ſetling which had I not been active, it is more than probable, it would ſcarce have been effected by our noble Founder; it has put mee to a far greater expens, then the ſtipend amounts to: nevertheles, after the great work of the Bibles and Heptaglot was finiſhed, no one thing has run more in my thoughts, and more than ſo, then how to farther any way our academical intereſt. Formerly I procured towards the purchace of this unparalled ineſtimable treaſure, no leſs than a thouſand pounds, without any charg to the colledges, excepting 3 perſons only, the reſt was promiſed by Biſhops, Deans, and Dignified men. The miſcarriage of the attempt, I have made known. Since, it is no ſmall greif to think, how this once apprized Gem is now depreciated; a diſcouragement to any ſuch kind of Benefacture. However (moſt honoured Sir), tho I have no thanks at al for the precious time, tedious jaunts, and to-mee-no eaſy charg in proſecution of my real intentions, I humbly beſeech you (moſt worthy Sir) that Dr. Marſhall, a Head in Oxford, unto whom, by your appointment, in a letter ſent him from Cambridg, a

promiſe was made, that ſome recompence ſhould be given him, for his forwardnes, pains, and charge, againſt the guiſe of the place in which he is, in offering ſo willingly to advance an emulous concern. Sir, This I hope you wil deem very juſt and equitable, that I be not damnified by this ſo reaſonably engaged promiſe.

Sir, Vouchſafe mee your pardon but this once: if I ſin this offenſe any more, I will crave your ſevereſt puniſhment without any mercy upon

REVEREND SIR,

Your verieſt real and

moſt redevable Servant,

Higham Gobin,
16 Auguſt, 74.

EDMUND CASTELL.

Directed thus,

To my much eſteemed friend
Dr. Spencer Maſter of Corpus
Chriſti College in Cambridge
Theſe

At the Colledge in Ely preſent.

Poſt paid.

P. 201. The elegant Historian of English Poetry has lately furnished an additional proof of early forgery, in a case where the name of CORSELLIS himself occurs. Speaking (in his first volume, p. 131.) of a Latin romance of the Life of ALEXANDER, he says, "Among Mr. HEARNE's books in the Bodleian "Library, there is an edition in quarto, without "date, supposed to have been printed at Oxford by "FREDERICK CORSELLIS, about the year 1468." But in a subsequent note (vol. II. p. 8.) Mr. WARTON ingeniously adds, "On examination, that "impression is said to be finished Decemb. 17, 1468. "Unluckily, the seventeenth day of December was "a Sunday that year. A manifest proof that the "name of CORSELLIS was forged."

It is a somewhat singular circumstance that the "Expoficio Sancti Ieronimi" has precisely the same date, "Dec. 17, 1468," (see above, p. 183).—I am inclined, therefore, to think that both were the genuine productions of CORSELLIS at the Oxford press, and that the accidental omission of an x, which Dr. MIDDLETON conjectures to have happened in the one colophon, was inattentively continued in the other.

It may not be unacceptable to the reader who wishes to know more of the character or the crime of HENRY JUSTICE (see p. 201.) to be referred to a particular account of his trial, in Gent. Mag. 1736. p. 292.

A Reviſal of the preceding pages, aſſiſted by a learned Friend who does not think ſuch ſtudies beneath his attention, enables me to add the following Remarks and Corrections.

P. 181. Record *and* MS. means, in the looſe ſtyle of former times, Record *or* MS. Thus, by a foundation in St. John's College, Cambridge, about 1510, for two Fellowſhips, &c. the perſon to be choſen "muſt be born in the counties of Derby *and* Staf-"ford." This a Viſitor has determined to mean *or*, as one perſon could not be born in both. And ſee Mr. Malone's ingenious remark, in the "Supplement "to Shakſpeare," vol. I. p. 404. n. 3.—"Record *in* MS." was perhaps intended by Atkins. See pp. 183, 184, 185. 190.

P. 182. D. There is a ſecond edition of Marchand, or at leaſt a ſupplement to his work.

P. 189. John Bagford died at Iſlington, a little before ſix in the morning, May 15, 1716; and was buried the Monday following in the church-yard belonging to the Charter-houſe. His MSS. may be of uſe to ſuch, as will take pains to extract good matter from a bad hand and worſe orthography. This may be eaſily forgiven to his education, far from learned, being originally a ſhoe-maker; and all his improvements were owing to the ſtrength of genius, ſeconded by unuſual diligence and induſtry. A number of his letters to Humphry Wanley may be ſeen

 in

in the British Museum. A large part of his collections is in the Public Library at Cambridge.

P. 196. note, l. 14. r. "suggested to establish it."

P. 203. l. ult. r. "sculptured,"

P. 218. l. 11. r. "tamen"

P. 222. l. 1. r. "suppostitio"

P. 223. l. 1. r. "For, supposing him to be impudent enough to address the monarch and the nobility, would not he be more likely to get punishment than reward?"

P. 224. l. 21. The "quod certo" &c. of Meerman is too strong for "I am very well assured," &c. in p. 186.

P. 225. l. 23. r. "that an authentic copy was for some time" &c.

P. 229. l. 11. r. "perceiving the consequence, &c. to be inconclusive,"—l. 20. r. "adds weight"

P. 230, 231. Q. if Meerman's "*Wood*" is not the same with "*Rood*" in p. 237?

P. 233. l. 3. r. "from whom it differs in more than one place,"

L. 18. r. "Now it was an allowed point, before Atkins's time, that" &c.

P. 235. l. 7. r. "that, almost from" &c.

L. 13. r. "which began"

L. 18. r. "you well observed"

P. 243. note, l. 4. r. "were not known"

P. 244. l. 4. r. "historia"—l. 15. "Herbert"

P. 246. l. 6. r. "Archetypum"—l. 9. "tradiderit"—l. 15. "plures"—note, l. 2. "I have"

P. 257.

P. 257. r. "That Art, O Latini, with which you were earlier acquainted, is now also known to us."—By *Latini*, perhaps, *ancient Romans* are here meant. "Though one of you could call us Britons, &c. yet "now we take pleasure in your language, &c."

P. 259. SS. l. 6. r. "imprimendum"—l. 9. "antecedit."

P. 260. That there are books existing from the press of Clemens Patavinus, is evident from Maittaire. This Ecclesiastic's ingenuity is the greater, as he never saw any body work; but that is not known to be the case of Hunte, who, it may be supposed, learnt from his associate Rood, a Veteran.

The beautiful types which have very lately been used in Mr. *Halhed's* Persian Grammar were cut at Bengal in twelve months, under his own personal inspection, and with no other knowledge of the Founder's art than what he had acquired from an attentive perusal of books.

P. 261. l. 7. "since such kind of reasoning is manifestly very weak from principles of logic."

P. 262. l. 15. r. "Anglia"

P. 278. l. 10. Mr. Morgan was Fellow of St. John's College, and afterwards had the College living of Medburn in Leicestershire; was very intimate at Wimple, but never got any thing from thence.

P. 286. Since the paragraph on Chinese Block-printing was printed off, I have seen, in the collection of Dr. DUCAREL, amongst many other curious speci-